

# The Classical Review

JULY 1901.

THE Executive Committee of the British School at Rome have issued an appeal (dated May, 1901) from which the following are extracts—

The project of founding in Rome a recognised British centre of study and research, offering to British students the advantages which German, French, Austrian, and American students already enjoy in the institutions provided by their respective countries, has been frequently mooted both in this country and by residents in Rome.

Early in 1899 it was taken up in a definite form by the Committee of the British School at Athens; a strong General Committee was formed for the purpose of bringing the scheme before the public and inviting promises of support; and a small Executive was appointed 'to take such further steps as may be necessary pending the transfer of the proposed School to the Committee of the British School at Athens.'

The intention indicated in a circular which was widely distributed in November, 1899, to issue in the spring of the following year an appeal for the Schools at Rome and Athens jointly, was necessarily abandoned owing to the prevailing national emergency. But a small fund was raised which enabled the Committee to make a tentative beginning; a Director (Mr. G. McN. Rushforth, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford) was appointed, and proceeded to Rome in November, 1900; an excellent set of rooms was acquired in January, 1901, in the Palazzo Odescalchi, Piazza SS. Apostoli; and the School was formally opened by Lord Currie, H.M. Ambassador to the Quirinal, on April 11 last.

The work of the School has already begun. The Director, in addition to a full report on the recent excavations, published in the *Times* of January 9, and to assistance given to visitors to Rome at Easter, has delivered an exhaustive lecture, which will shortly be published, on the ancient Church of Santa Maria Antiqua. A monograph on the 'Roman Roads in the Campagna,' by Mr. T. Ashby, late Craven Fellow in the University of Oxford, and now a student at the School, is also nearly ready for publication.

The School, it should be remembered, will not be exclusively classical and archaeological. On the contrary, it is intended to be a centre for all British

students in Rome; and the Provisional Scheme, approved by the General Committee, provides that every period of the language and literature, antiquities, art and history of Rome and Italy shall be considered as falling within its province.

Funds are urgently needed, in the shape both of annual subscriptions and of donations. If the School is to be maintained in a really efficient manner an annual income of at least £1,000 is required. The Committee desire to obtain also a capital sum of not less than £3,000, for such purposes as the extension of the library, the furnishing of the rooms, etc.

Up to the present the annual subscriptions amount to only about £250, and the donations to about £760.

Upon the need for the new School, our correspondent in Rome, Mr. Ashby, writes as follows. The experience which he has gained upon the spot gives his opinion a special value:

I am sure, from my own experience, that for archaeological and other students here in Rome, such a School is a necessity. During the period of my residence here I have met with unflinching kindness from the heads of the German, French, and American Schools, and from Italian archaeologists; but I have always felt the need of some centre for British students; and the warmth and enthusiasm of the welcome which the representatives of other nations have offered to our new School and its director, form in themselves a sufficient proof that its desirability is recognised on all hands, and that its prosperity, if this can be secured, will be beneficial to students and workers of other nations as well as of our own.

We would earnestly commend the appeal to all friends of scholarship and archaeology in this country. Subscriptions may be sent to Dr. Walter Leaf, 6 Sussex Place, Regent's Park, N.W.

*Was muss der Gebildete vom Griechischen wissen?* is the title of a book which appeared in the same year as 'G. H. S.' penned

his two remarkable 'Letters to a Classical Friend,' the second of which appears in our present issue: and the answer which 'G. H. S.' there returns to the question is an unfaltering *Nichts!* To all of us who hope for the classical literatures, and for Greek literature in particular, a not less magnificent rôle in the future than they have played in the past, and who believe that a serious curtailment in the sphere of this influence will be a serious loss to human culture and education, the frank confessions and outspoken denunciations of this would-be friend who has become a foe, *donnent furieusement à penser*. The curious paradox of 'G. H. S.'s' intellect, his seeming ability to appreciate English poetry and his avowed incapacity to see anything in Greek, his love and admiration of Milton and Shelley and his repugnance to the ancient writings which Milton and Shelley loved and admired, need not trouble us here: this Review is not concerned with *lusus naturae* as such. It is very different with the matter of his criticisms; and *fas est et ab hoste doceri* is a saying the force of which Englishmen at the present time should be the first to acknowledge.

English scholars have heard a good deal lately of the evil effects of 'specialism' in classics. But now it is announced that classics itself is a study only fit for specialists. And this proposition emanates from a member of a University whose classical curriculum and examinations are generally thought to be excellently planned for keeping specialism in its proper place. The circumstance is notable.

Attentive readers of the strictures of 'G. H. S.' will observe that they refer to two quite separate matters. Part of them deal with defects in the modes and methods of classical teaching. Upon the question of particular criticisms there may be different opinions: but his complaint of the labour of learning Greek and Latin most people will consider well grounded. In the phrasing of his complaint, 'sheer fag,' 'grind,' 'labour,' and the like, we have the voice not of his opinions but of his experience; and unfortunately it is the experience of many. So far as the teaching of the schools is concerned, this labour cannot be alleviated by being spread over a larger number of hours. It is hardly possible that there will be more time in the future allotted to classics: it is

more than probable that there will be less. While these lines are passing through the press, a meeting is being held under the presidency of a Regius Professor of Greek 'to urge the necessity of giving modern languages a more prominent position in the educational curricula of the country.' The demands of these subjects can hardly be refused, and it is the classical time-table that must satisfy them. If then Greek and Latin studies are not to fall behind, the load they carry must be lightened.

Another complaint appears at first sight to refer to the character of the classics themselves. They are said to be 'hackneyed.' It is strange that the literature of races and civilisations so different in countless ways from our own should be 'hackneyed.' For un luckily our knowledge of it is not inherited; but every one has to gain it for himself. A great deal—no doubt a great deal too much—has been written *about* the classics; but on this showing the North Pole will be 'hackneyed' too. The solution of the puzzle is not far to seek. What classics has in common with modern literature 'G. H. S.' and others in his case find hackneyed, and the remainder unintelligible. This mixture of course produces nausea; it would be a miracle if it did not.

In reality the two causes of this nausea are intimately connected. What seems at first sight trite and commonplace in Greek and Latin literature, does so because its setting has been imperfectly understood. As intelligence of its surroundings grows, it gains in freshness and brightness, with often the apparently paradoxical result that the original form of a familiar thought appears the most novel of all. It is upon intelligence then that the whole question hinges. Can the classics be taught in such a way that the life and thought of ancient Greek and Roman times shall be a reality to the average student? If they can, he will gain, as the best judges in all countries since the Revival of Learning agree, intellectual profit which can be his in no other way. If they cannot, then classics will become what 'G. H. S.' declares it to be, a study only for the 'specialist': and only specialists will pursue it. This disaster, for such we believe it would be, it behoves all friends of the higher education to take speedy steps to avert.

## TWO ERRORS OF MEMORY IN THE TELEMACHY.

IN the Prolegomena to his book *de tribus Hom. Od. codd. ant. pp. 14 and 22-5*, Molhuysen shows how the scribes have often added or miswritten a line of Homer through untimely recollection of other passages in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, so that our MSS. of these poems display errors of memory, as well as errors of eye and ear. Thus, to take two of his instances, after *Od. iv. 796*, which ends *δέμας δ' ἦκτο γυναῖκί*, the good MS. P adds the verse *καλῇ κ.τ.λ.*, which follows the same verse-ending *Od. xiii. 288-9*; and the Florentine F has in *Od. xiv. 485* instead of *ἐμπαίως ἰπάκουσε, ἐμμ. ἀνόρουσε* through recollection of *Il. v. 836 ἐμμ. ἀπόρουσεν*, the only other Homeric instance of *ἐμπαίως*. These errors are probably the result of association affecting the mind of the copyist at the very time of writing. But a little consideration will show us that there were times when the scope was far greater for the influence of mental association on the Epic text.

For, at whatever date writing was first used in the transmission of Greek Epic, we may be sure that for a considerable period the written copy was not intended to delight private readers, or to be read to an audience, like the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. It served the same purposes as the copy of an actor's part, *i.e.* professional reciters learnt it by heart, and afterwards used it to refresh the memory. Of parts, at least, of their *répertoire* the Greek reciters no doubt took about with them MSS. which served the same purpose as the Oxford MS. of the Song of Roland:— 'it is' writes M. Léon Gautier, *La Chanson de Roland*, p. xxvi. 'one of the little volumes for the use of the *jongleurs* which they carried with them wherever they went, and in which they doubtless refreshed their memory.'

Besides reciting, the rhapsodist would also train pupils, for in primitive societies the same man both teaches and practises a craft; and he would give them his own written texts, or copies of them, to get by heart. But where the papyrus or parchment (cf. Herod. v. 58 and Birt, *d. ant. Buchwesen*, p. 47) was rubbed or torn or otherwise obliterated, he would have to supply the deficiency from memory; and he would again have to rely on memory, if he wished his pupils to learn any part of his *répertoire* that he had not by him in writ-

ing. For where should he procure copies? He would have to make the copy by writing or dictating from memory. Evidently, a text thus dependent on memory would be likely to contain such errors as are incidental to transmission by memory; and the mistakes of a popular rhapsodist would, through his pupils and pupils' pupils, obtain a widespread and enduring circulation.

So long as the Epics appealed only to the listening circle in the noble's hall or at a public festival, the only written texts must have been those produced for and through the reciters; for the demand regulates the supply. They alone, therefore, can have formed the written basis of those copies that were produced for private persons in ever increasing numbers as education developed; and to them, or immediately to the living voice of the rhapsodist, we must ultimately trace back our own MSS. of Homer. These, therefore, are likely to contain errors due to misrecollection on the part of the rhapsodists.

It is true that the rhapsodists were men whose memory was highly trained and developed. They may also have had some sort of *memoria technica* to assist them. But even a highly trained memory does not quite completely secure its contents against the subtle, half-unconscious influence of association; and I have, I think, found two lines in the Telemachy in which the right reading has been displaced by the influence of other passages that were associated in thought with these. If I am right, then, as the present readings are clearly those of the old vulgate, they may be safely referred to the period before the texts of the Epics ceased to be dependent on the memories of reciters.

The lines are *ii. 251* and *iv. 514*. In the former *πλέονεσι* (so MSS. and Scholia, see Note B) has, I submit, supplanted *περὶ δαίρι*; and in the second, the universal *Μαλεΐδων* should be *Ἀθηναίων*.

I.—*Od. ii. 251.*

At the third and final stage of the debate in *Od. ii.* Telemachos demands a ship that he may go in search of his father. Before any reply is made to this request, Mentor, an aged friend of the royal family, makes an appeal to the people to interfere on be-

half of Telemachos. This appeal is expressed in the form of a reproach and ends with the lines:

νῦν δ' ἄλλω δῆμῳ νημεσίζομαι, οἷον ἅπαντες  
240 ἦσθ' ἄνεω ἅτ' οὐ τι καθαπτόμενοι ἐπέεσσι  
παύρους μνηστῆρας κατερύκετε πολλοὶ  
έόντες.

To this speech a contemptuous reply is made by Leokritos son of Euenor (vv. 243-51), after which he winds up the debate by dismissing the assembly and refusing Telemachos' request for a vessel (vv. 252-6). The difficulties of the first part of this speech, the reply to Mentor, are notorious; and for the results of previous efforts towards a solution, I may be allowed merely to refer to Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang* on ii. 243; the editions of Merry,<sup>1</sup> and of v. Leeuwen-da Costa; and a note at the end of Butcher and Lang's translation. As a preliminary to setting forth the present proposal, I will quote the passage.

τὸν δ' Εὐηνορίδης Λειώκριτος ἀντίον ἦδα·  
Μέντορ ἀταρτηγρέ, φρένας ἡλέε, ποῖον  
ἔειπες  
ἡμέας ὀτρύνων καταπαυέμεν. ἀργαλέον δέ  
245 ἀνδράσι καὶ πλεόνεσσι μαχέσασθαι περὶ  
δαιτί.  
εἰ περ γάρ κ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Ἰθακήσιος αὐτὸς  
ἐπελθὼν  
δαινυμένους κατὰ δῶμα ἔδ' ὄν μνηστῆρας  
ἀγανούς  
ἐξελίσσαι μεγάρῳ μεινυήσῃ ἐνὶ θυμῷ,  
οὐ κέν οἱ κεχάροίτο γυνή, μάλα περ  
χατέουσα,  
250 ἔλθόντ', ἀλλὰ κεν αὐτοῦ ἀεκέα πότμον  
ἐπίσποι,  
εἰ πλεόνεσσι μάχοιτο· σὺ δ' οὐ κατὰ μοῖραν  
ἔειπες.

The logic of this reply is as follows. Mentor has urged the people 'being many' to check the 'few' suitors by words, *καθαπτόμενοι ἐπέεσσι*, a colourless phrase, which is as suitable to friendly as to unfriendly address (*cf.* 39). But, obviously, the suitors are not men to be influenced by words, or by anything short of force. Accordingly, Leokritos wastes no time discussing a policy of diplomatic representations. Tacitly assuming (a shrewd stroke of debate) that interference means fighting—the Epic, let us always remember, not needing to be as explicit in respect to the readily obvious, as, say, a Government

<sup>1</sup> Merry's theory that Mentor is the subject of the infinitive *μαχέσασθαι*, might incline one to read in v. 245 ἀνδράσι σε πλεόνεσσι for ἀ. καὶ πλ. of MSS.

report—he tells Mentor that he is a downright fool to urge the people to stop the suitors, inasmuch as to pick a quarrel at a feast is a grievous matter, even for men that have numbers on their side.

The clause *ἀργαλέον δέ κ.τ.λ.* is a justification of the preceding abuse. *ἀργαλέον* has the meaning, less of 'difficult,' than of 'burdensome,' 'grievous,' 'more than can be expected of a man,' as in *Od.* xiii. 15—

ἀργαλέον γὰρ ἔνα προκοῦς χαρίσασθαι.

καὶ has the same force as in *Il.* xx. 356—

ἀργαλέον δέ μοί ἐστι καὶ ἰφθίμῳ περ ἔόντι  
τοσσοῦσδ' ἀνθρώπους ἐφέπειν καὶ πᾶσι μάχεσθαι.

The use of *μαχέσασθαι* without an expressed object is common enough; *e.g.* we have *ὀτρύνων μαχέσασθαι Il.* v. 496, vi. 105, xi. 213. On this point and on the force of the aorist, 'to begin,' 'take up the combat,' *cf.* Mitzbauer, *Grundlagen d. gr. Tempuslehre*, p. 88.

In *περὶ δαιτί* the local force is alone present, as is usual in Homer, or is, at least, predominant; for the only effective means of stopping the feastings of the suitors would be armed interference at the banquet itself.

Leokritos goes on to show how the general proposition *ἀργαλέον δέ κ.τ.λ.* applies to the particular case of the Ithacan *ἄημος*. 'For even,' he says, 'if Odysseus of Ithaca should return himself and desire to expel from the hall the lordly suitors as they feasted in his house, his wife would have no joy in him, though she should be very desirous of him, on his coming, but he would meet an unseemly fate on the spot' (vv. 246-50). So far the reasoning is clear and pertinent, though it is not fully set forth. Plainly, if the suitors would not brook interference at the banquet from Odysseus himself, they would not submit to it from the *ἄημος*, not even in face of superior numbers, without first taking some lives; but to risk their lives in this fashion is more than can be expected of the people.

But the MSS. go on with v. 251, 'if he (*sc.* *Od.*) should fight against superior numbers.' This cannot be right, for Leokritos and his audience are not concerned with the danger involved in an attack on a majority, but with the danger to that majority to which Mentor has appealed, if it attacks the suitors at the feast. We must either excise the line, as do many editors, or emend it. Now, if we excise it, we lose the words *σὺ δ' οὐ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες*, which round off very



fittingly the part of the speech dealing with Mentor; but if, instead of εἰ πλεόνεσσι μάχοιτο, we read εἰ περὶ δαυτὶ μ., it seems possible to explain readily both the line and its corruption.

εἰ περὶ δαυτὶ μάχοιτο briefly repeats vv. 246-8 εἴ περ γάρ κ'... δαυνόμενος... ἐξελάσαι μεγάροιο μενούησει, which is itself a repetition of the more general expression μαχέσασθαι περὶ δαυτὶ in 245. The corruption was easy for two reasons. In the first place, πλεόνεσσι and περὶ δαυτὶ agree in their first and last sounds, and in the number and the quantities of their syllables. In the second place, there occurs six lines above πλεόνεσσι μαχέσασθαι περὶ δαυτὶ, which would tend to make the memory hesitate in 251 between the two expressions πλ. and π.δ. and would suggest πλ. μάχοιτο for that line rather than π.δ.μ.: cf. the reading, noted by Molhuysen, *l.l.*, p. 24, of Eustathius and one or two other authorities of *Od.* xiv. 21 ἔκτος ἱανor instead of αἰν ζ., because ζ. ζ. has come just before in v. 16. But in the case of ii. 251 the decisive factor in the corruption was, probably, the half-unconscious influence on the rhapsodist of other Odyssean passages where a majority and a minority are contrasted, the suitors being in these the majority, not their assailants. Such passages are:

xvi. 244.

ἄνδρε δὴν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισι μάχεσθαι.

xx. 30.

μοῖνος ἔων πολέσι.

xxiii. 12.

τίς κ' οἴοιτο μετ' ἀνδράσι δαυτόμενος  
μοῦνον ἐνὶ πλεόνεσσι κ.τ.λ.

The remainder of the speech is not difficult. I deal in Note A with the question, who was Leokritos, and in Note B, with a supposed reading of Didymus and Aristarchus in ii. 251.

## II.—*Od.* iv. 514.

In Proteus' account of the return and death of Agamemnon, we read that he escaped shipwreck, for (δὲ adding an explanation) Here saved him (vv. 512-3). The passage continues

514 ἅλλ' ὅτε δὴ τάχ' ἔμελλε Μαλειῶν ὄρος αἰπὺ  
ἔεσθαι κ.τ.λ.

As we have just been told of Here's protection, we should expect to find that Agamemnon was about to reach some point on his

proper course; but this would not take him to Malea. Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang*, suggest that he followed the Phoenician sea-route from Asia through the southern series of islands to Malea; but this would be a very roundabout way from Troy. He would naturally go to the southern Euboean promontory, Geraistos, either, if the weather was fair, leaving Psyrie on his left, or by the route between Chios and Cape Mimas on the peninsula of Erythrai (cf. *Od.* iii. 169-178 and Tozer, *Hist. of Anc. Geogr.*, p. 23). From Geraistos he would pass on to Sounion, like Menelaos and Nestor (iii. 278). But while they had to round Malea, in order to reach the Laconic Gulf and Pylos respectively, any one returning to Mycenae would coast round the Argolis, making for some point at or near Nauplia; or, rather, in the days when Argos and Tiryns were as independent of Mycenae as Pylos or Athens, he would sail up to the head of the Saronic gulf and reach the capital along one of those three Cyclopean highways connecting Mycenae with Corinth, and 'pointing to Corinth' as the northern base of which the Pelopid Mycenae was an outpost' (cf. Tsountas and Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age*, pp. 16 and 35-8).

Dr. Merry (*ad. loc.*) suggests that a storm (*Od.* v. 109) first drifted Agamemnon south, and he worked up again until he sighted Malea. But, on this view, the passage omits details that are not obvious from the context, and is not worded with the usual Homeric lucidity.

If, however, we read <sup>2</sup> ἔμελλεν Ἀθηνῶν instead of ἔμελλε Μαλειῶν, all becomes clear. Ἀθηνῶν ὄρος αἰπὺ is Σούνιον ἶδον . . . ἄκρον Ἀθηνῶν (*Od.* iii. 278) which is on the natural route from Troy. The change to the vulgate was possible because of the similarity in sound, the difference being only -ma-lei-ā- for -na-thē-nā-, and was caused by recollection of the parallel passage in the account of Menelaos' return:—

*Od.* iii. 286.

ἅλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κείνος ἰὼν ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον  
ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῇσι Μαλειῶν ὄρος αἰπὺ  
ἔξε θέων τότε δὴ στυγερὴν ὁδὸν κτλ.

For another corruption in the account of Agamemnon's return, I refer to Note C.

<sup>1</sup> In connecting Corinth, etc. rather than Argos, with Mycenae, the Catalogue (559-80) is in harmony with the results of modern investigation.

<sup>2</sup> Rather 'if we "hear"' since recollection of a text is recollection of sounds, rather than of writing, especially on the part of a reciter who probably learnt the text by repeating it many times aloud.

## NOTE A.—LEOKRITOS.

We receive no information in *Od.* ii about this person, though we are told something about all the others that we first meet at the debate, Aigyptios, Halitherses, and Mentor—we have already found Antinoos and Eurymachos among the suitors in Bk. i. It is usual to regard him as a suitor, since one of the same name and patronymic is mentioned among the killed in xxii. 294. Besides, Telemachos' demand for a boat seems to be addressed to the suitors (ii. 212). On the other hand, a label so rarely used might be attached inadvertently to two minor personages in passages so far apart—the composers of early Epic had no convenient *index nominum* to prevent such slips—and the name ('Chosen-of-the-people') would be very suitable in ii for a spokesman of the people. Besides, both the grammar and sense of the speech are in favour of the speaker not being a suitor. The order of words, coupled with the fact that Mentor has just been urging the people to check the suitors, makes it more natural to construe *ἡμέας ὁτρύνων καταπαύειν* 'urging us to check (the suitors)' than 'urging (the people) to check us.' If Mentor gives bad advice to the people, it is rather for them to reproach him with folly than for the suitors; and the statement that the suitors would kill *Odysseus*, if he interfered with them while they feasted, is in marked contrast with the affectation of right that the suitors have in the previous speeches maintained; it would come far better from one who was not a suitor.

The logic of the speech is the same in both cases.

NOTE B.—AN ANCIENT EMENDATION OF  
*Od.* ii. 251.

The scholia show that the line was emended to *πλεόνεσσαν ἔποιτο* instead of *πλ. μάχοιτο*, on the principle that if *Odysseus* 'went along with many,' many would be going along with him, and so the suitors would be the minority as Mentor suggested (v. 241). After deducting the emendations of Buttmann and Dindorf, we get the following scholion:—

εἰ πλεόνεσσαν [ἔποιτο] εἰ πολλοὶ αὐτῷ ἔποιτο ἢ εἰ πολλοὺς ὁπαδοὺς ἔχοι. τινὲς δὲ γελοίως γράφουσι μάχοιτο. It is strange that Buttmann and later editors have not seen that the lemma is perfectly sound, and shows, perhaps a naive, but an intelligible correction of the ordinary *μάχοιτο*; and, as a note on the reading *πλ. ἔποιτο*, the scholion is necessary and correct. The Buttmann-Dindorf change to *πλεόνεσι* renders the note 'if many accompanied him, or if he had many attendants' superfluous and inept: it makes necessary Dindorf's insertion of *εἰ πλεόνεσσι* before *μάχοιτο*, besides being itself impossible in Homer because the opt. 3 pl. *ἔποιτο* is un-Homeric, as v. Leeuwen-da Costa point out in their note. When Ludwich writes '*πλεόνεσι* οἱ ἔποιτο (Aristarchus?) Didymus,' he wrongs those worthies.

NOTE C.—*Od.* iv. 519-20.

According to the vulgate, (1) Agamemnon is swept away by a storm to the neighbourhood of Aigisthos (vv. 515-8); (2) the wind changes, and he reaches home (519-23); and (3) he is invited to Aigisthos' house and murdered (524 *seq.*). Of these three stages in the story, it can hardly be doubted that (1) was intended to lead up to (3), whereas in the existing version it has no bearing at all on (3). Some editors, therefore, transpose 517-8 and 519-20, so that the stages become (1) Agamemnon is swept away by a storm (515-6), (2) a favourable wind brings him home to the neighbourhood of Aigisthos (519-20, 517-18, 521-3), and (3) as before. But with this arrangement, *οἰκάδ' ἵκοντο* at the end of 520 is immediately followed, as by an explanation, by *ἀγροῦ ἐν' ἐσχατὴν* at the beginning of 517. 'Home,' however, should mean the city, but the expression *ἀγροῦ κτλ.* means a place far from the city; cf. *Od.* v. 489.

It is more probable that vv. 519-20 beginning with the words *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ* were composed by a reciter as a substitute for vv. 514-8 beginning with the same words, i.e. 519 *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κείθεν* was composed to follow 513, and *κείθεν* meant from the storm in which Aias was wrecked. The change was made in order to suit hearers who believed that the murder took place at Mycenae.

After the removal of these lines the story becomes quite clear. Aigisthos, who had removed Klytæmnestre from the royal house in Mycenae (cf. iii 272) was living on his father's old estate at a distance from the capital (iv 517-8). For a year a man in his service had been watching, iv 527 *μή εἰ λάθοι παριὼν μῆσαιτο δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς*, i.e. lest Agamemnon should pass unobserved by him (the watchman, or perhaps Aig.) to the capital, find his wife gone, and prepare to attack Aigisthos before the latter had news of the husband's return. Fate favoured Aigisthos by carrying Agamemnon out of his course so that he landed at a distance from the city near Aigisthos' lonely dwelling. The watchman caught sight of him, gave word of his arrival, and there followed the paramour's invitation to the husband, who little suspected that his wife was living in his host's zenana.

We need not be troubled because Agamemnon, landing unexpectedly near Aigisthos' house, was seen by a man who was looking for him on the route to Mycenae. The watcher *ἀπὸ σκοπιῆς εἶδε* (524), i.e. the outlook is from the top of a hill whence a wide prospect is enjoyed of sea and land. Cf. II. iv 275, v 771, or take as an example of what the poet meant by *σκοπιή* the real ancient fort near Mycenae 'on the lofty summit of St. Elias, which served at the same time as a watch-tower and beacon-station,' and from which 'the whole Argolic plain and gulf and the mountain region to Corinth and beyond can readily be watched' (Tsountas and Manatt, *l.l.* p. 38).

C. M. MULVANY.

Bonn, 1901.

NOTE ON EURIPIDES, *HECUBA*, LL. 1214-15.

'Αλλ' ἡνίχ' ἡμεῖς οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει,  
καπνῷ δ' ἐσήμην' ἄστυ πολέμιων ὕπο,  
ξένον κατέκτας.

It is impossible to render the second of these lines unless what Paley calls 'a singular ellipse' be assumed. The editors of elementary editions say that a participle is to be supplied. But Nauck saw that no satisfactory defence had been put forward, and fell back on conjecture.

The scholiast says that ἐσήμην' is for ἐσήμηνε τὸ ἡμᾶς μηκέτι εἶναι ἐν φάει, and the note looks as if he read the passage correctly punctuated, as follows:

'Αλλ' ἡνίχ' ἡμεῖς οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει  
(καπνῷ δ' ἐσήμην' ἄστυ) πολέμιων ὕπο,  
ξένον κατέκτας.

The parenthesis is thrown in to show how Polymestor knew that the Trojans were

lost, and it heightens the bitterness of the reproach. οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει πολέμιων ὕπο go together. It should be added that the change of tense—ἐσμὲν, ἐσήμην'—becomes clearer with this explanation, which, I hope, disposes of the inferior reading ἦμεν.

A very similar correction of *Phoenissae* l. 275 was made by Weil in the *Journal des Savants* for April 1889, where for

'Αλλ' ἐγγὺς ἀλκή· βώμιοι γὰρ ἐσχάροι  
πέλας πάρεσι, κοῦκ ἔρημα δώματα.  
φέρ' ἐς σκοτεινὰς περιβολὰς μεθ' ἑξίφος

he gives

'Αλλ' ἐγγὺς ἀλκή· (βώμιοι γὰρ ἐσχάροι  
πέλας πάρεσι) κοῦκ ἔρημα δώματα.  
φέρ' ἐς σκοτεινὰς περιβολὰς μεθ' ἑξίφος.

This seems to me clearly right.

E. C. MARCHANT.

## PLATONICA.—III.

(Continued from p. 116.)

## EUTHYDEMUS.

276 E ὦ Ζεῦ, ἔφην ἐγώ, ἧ μὲν καὶ τὸ πρότερον γε καλὸν ἡμῖν ἐφάνη.

καλόν should I think be ἱκανόν, a word often confused with it. The point is that one such dialectical display was quite enough. Cf. 278 D.

277 C πότερον οὖν εἰσὶν οἱ λαμβάνοντες οἰοῦν οἱ ἔχοντες ἥδῃ ἢ οἱ ἂν μὴ; οἱ ἂν μὴ ἔχωσιν.

Schanz writes 'ἔχωσιν delevi, post ἧ οἱ ἂν μὴ transposuit Badham.' Another alternative is to leave ἔχωσιν alone, but in the preceding sentence to write ἧ οἱ μὴ, omitting ἂν.

282 E For ὥσπερ Hermann writes ὥς γάρ, Schanz ὥς ὥσπερ. I would suggest ὥς ὅπερ. Cf. 305 A.

295 A ἡδιστα ταῦτα ἐξελέγχουμαι.

The context excludes the possibility of this being a general statement, nor can it refer to the present moment, as the ἔλεγχος has not begun. It ought therefore to be in the future, corresponding to the ἐπιδείξω and

ἐπιδείξεις before and after. I do not find the future passive ἐξελέγξουμαι anywhere, but either that or ἐξελεγχ<θήσ>ουμαι ought to be read.

301 C ἐπεὶ τὰ ἄλλα μοι δοκεῖτε, ὥσπερ οἱ δημιουργοὶ ἅ ἐκάστοις προσήκει ἀπεργάζεσθαι, καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ διαλέγεσθαι παγκάλως ἀπεργάζεσθαι.

Heindorf was inclined to omit the first ἀπεργάζεσθαι. Rather alter it to ἀπεργάζονται, which has been accidentally assimilated to the other. To say nothing of any other objection, the cacophony is intolerable.

302 D οὐκοῦν καὶ οὗτοι σοὶ θεοὶ ἂν εἶεν;

Add οἱ before θεοί. σοὶ alone is predicate. So just below καὶ ζῶα εἰσὶν οὗτοι οἱ θεοί. Perhaps there should be a γὰρ after πρόγονοι.

303 D ταύτους τοὺς λόγους πάνν μὲν ἂν ὁ λόγιος ἀγαπῶν· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι οὕτω νοοῦσιν B } αὐτοὺς ὥστε κ.τ.λ. ἀγνοοῦσιν T }

Neither νοοῦσιν nor ἀγνοοῦσιν makes any sense and various substitutes have been proposed. (δυσχερ) αἰνοῦσιν would be very suitable.

305 C οὔτοι γὰρ εἰσὶν μὲν, ὃ Κρίτων, οὓς ἔφη Πρῶδικος μεθύρια φιλοσόφου τε ἀνδρὸς καὶ πολιτικοῦ, οἷονταί δ' εἶναι πάντων σοφώτατοι ἀνθρώπων.

οὓς should probably be ὡς. That will give the point better, and with οὓς ἔφη we should certainly look for εἶναι. οὓς ἔφη can hardly stand for 'whom he called.'

#### PROTAGORAS.

322 C εἰς ἔχων ἱατρικὴν πολλοῖς ἱκανὸς ἰδιώταις, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι δημιουργοί.

Heindorf remarks here, *ipse haec narrans Plato scripsisset, ὁρίων*, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι δημιουργοὶ ὡσαύτως, a comment which I do not quite understand. That word or something like it seems necessary to the sense, and Plato must have written it.

327 C ὅστις σοι ἀδικιώτατος φαίνεται ἄνθρωπος τῶν ἐν νόμοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις τετραμμένων... εἰ δέοι αὐτὸν κρίνεσθαι πρὸς ἀνθρώπους οἷς μήτε παιδεία ἐστίν, μήτε δικαστήρια, μήτε νόμοι κ.τ.λ.

Besides the awkwardness of ἄνθρωπος (which Plato could quite well have omitted) with ἀνθρώποις, it will be seen that νόμοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις is a curious combination, which could only be justified by a contrast with animals or other infra-human creatures, whereas Plato goes on to give as the antithesis men of a lower kind without laws &c. You cannot contrast νόμοι καὶ ἄνθρωποι with ἀνθρώποι οἷς μὴ εἰσὶ νόμοι. Schanz cites the suggestions ἐν ἐννόμοις ἀνθρώποις, ἐν νόμοις καὶ ἐννόμοις ἀνθρώποις, ἐν νόμοις καὶ ἐν τρόποις, himself adopting the first.

It would seem to me most likely that ἄνθρωπος has been substituted for some other word by the accident common in all writing of putting one word for another, the word actually used being in the writer's mind for some other reason.<sup>1</sup> Thus here ἀνθρώποις is due to ἄνθρωπος preceding and perhaps also to ἀνθρώπους which is coming. I shall suggest below that in *Gorg.* 509 B βοήθειαν is a similar error due to the neighbourhood of βοηθεῖν. In such a case the two words confused need not resemble one another, though no doubt some resemblance facilitates the error. It is therefore harder and often impossible to restore the right word with any

<sup>1</sup> Within fifteen months I noticed the following cases of this in the work of pupils of mine. One wrote 'a wretched mariner instead of a *mariner*' in translating Eur. *Andr.* 457: another 'put his last entreaties to his kinsman into the hands of his *kinsman*' in translating Tac. *Ann.* 2. 30. 4: a third wrote in an essay 'in Book 7 (of the *Ethics*) Aristotle's conclusion seems to be that pleasure is the chief *book*' (for good).

confidence. Here perhaps all we can safely say is that it was a substantive, probably of three or four syllables and plural. Cf. on 361 c and on *Gorg.* 509 B.

334 A Read ἃ ἀνθρώποις <τὰ> μὲν ἀνωφελῆ ἐστὶν τὰ δέ γε ὠφέλιμα. See Heindorf's note, but I cannot think, as he seems to do, that μὲν with ἀνθρώποις has any propriety here. There is no antithesis to it. Cf. 343 E ὡς ἄρα ὄντων τινῶν τῶν μὲν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀγαθῶν, τῶν δὲ κ.τ.λ.

341 B δεινοῦ πλούτου κ.τ.λ. Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 967.

349 B πότερον ταῦτα, πέντε ὄντα ὀνόματα, ἐπὶ ἐνὶ πράγματι ἐστὶν... ἐφησθα ὅν σὺ οὐκ ὀνόματα ἐπὶ ἐνὶ εἶναι ἄλλ' ἕκαστον ἰδίῳ πράγματι τῶν ὀνομάτων τούτων ἐπικεῖσθαι.

Is it not clear that with οὐκ ὀνόματα we want some word to express plurality, 'a number of names for one thing'? I suggest that before the ε of ἐπὶ or εἶναι an ε = πέντε has dropped out.

358 B αἱ ἐπὶ τούτου πράξεις ἅπασαι, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀλύπως ζῆν καὶ ἡδέως, ἀρ' οὐ καλαί;

It does not appear that ἐπὶ with a genitive is used to express *end* and *object*, except in the case of actual movement, *ἵεναι ἐπὶ* etc. Can it be applied to action aiming at a particular end? If it cannot, then either some word expressive of metaphorical movement (such as Mr. Adam's *ἀγουσai*) has been lost, or we might suggest that a dative or accusative case should be written in both places, *τούτῳ* and *τῷ* or *τούτῳ* and *τό*.

361 c βουλοίμην ἂν ταῦτα διεξελθόντες ἡμᾶς ἐξελθεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὅ τε ἐστίν.

Ἐξελθεῖν seems an erroneous repetition of δι-εξελθεῖν. Read something like ἐπελθεῖν, comparing the note on 327 c.

#### GORGIAS.

451 A ἴθι νυν καὶ σὺ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἣν ἡρόμην διαπέρανον.

'The answer which I asked' is hardly a possible expression. For ἣν read ἧ 'in the way I put the question.'

456 A Adopting Madvig's insertion of τί, I should like to add δέ and read τί δ' εἰ.

457 c οἶμαι, ὦ Γοργία, καὶ σὲ ἐμπειρον εἶναι πολλῶν λόγων καὶ καθωρακέναι ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ τοιοῦδε, ὅτι οὐ ραδίως δύναται περὶ ὧν ἂν ἐπιχειρήσωσι διαλέγεσθαι διορισάμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους... οὕτω διαλύεσθαι τὰς συνουσίας.

To provide a subject for δύναται, λόγων has been altered to λογίων (Madvig), ἀνθρώπων (Cobet), φιλολόγων (Schanz). But

ἔμπειρος with a genitive of persons is very unusual, whereas λόγων ἔμπειρος is a combination that Plato uses more than once elsewhere. I would rather suggest that τινές, πολλοί, οἱ πολλοί, or something similar, has been lost in the clause beginning with ὅτι.

460 D εἰν ὁ πύκτης τῇ πυκτικῇ χρῆται τε καὶ ἀδικῇ;

χρῆται alone does not give the point. Read χρῆται τε <μὴ ὀρθῶς>. So three lines below οὐκ ὀρθῶς χρωμένῳ τῇ ῥητορικῇ and three times in the same context (D, E, and 461 A) ἀδίκως χρῆσθαι. (The notes *ap. Bekker* seem to show that there is some authority for μὴ καλῶς χρῆται τε. Schanz is silent on this point.)

464 D In the fancy of a physician and a cook contending before a jury of children πότερος ἔπαιε περί τῶν χρηστῶν σιτίων καὶ पोηρῶν I should have thought that some word like βέλτιον was almost necessary with ἔπαιε.

467 B ΠΩ. οὐκ οὖν ποιοῦσιν ἃ βούλονται. ΣΩ. οὐ φημι. ΠΩ. ποιοῦντες δὲ ἃ δοκεῖ αὐτοῖς; ΣΩ. φημί.

There is some authority for omitting δέ and some for reading ποιοῦσι δέ. But possibly ποιοῦντες γε is what Plato wrote. Cf. 496 E ΣΩ. οὐκοῦν κατὰ τὸ πίνειν χαίρειν λέγεις; ΚΑΛ. μάλιστα. ΣΩ. διψῶντά γε; ΚΑΛ. φημί.

ib. C εἰ μὲν ἔχεις ἐμὲ ἐρωτᾷν, ἐπιδείξον ὅτι ψεύδομαι· εἰ δὲ μὴ, αὐτὸς ἀποκρίνου. ΠΩ. ἀλλ' ἐθέλω ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἵνα καὶ εἰδῶ ὅ τι λέγεις.

Should not ἔχεις be ἐθέλεις? Written εἶπες or ἔλεις by accident, it might be corrected to ἔχεις.

470 A It seems clear that we must either omit the first τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι with W. H. Thompson or substitute for it something like τὸ ποιεῖν ἃ δοκεῖ αὐτῷ.

472 A-C In C ἔστιν μὲν οὖν οὗτός τις τρόπος ἐλέγχου... ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλος.

Cobet thought we should read εἰς for τις, and certainly either εἰς or εἰς τις seems preferable to simple τις. It occurs to me whether in A ἐνίοτε γὰρ ἂν καὶ καταψευδομαρτυρηθεῖ τις ὑπὸ πολλῶν καὶ δοκούντων εἶναι τί we ought not also to read εἰς. Cf. the εἶνα τινά just before and the εἰς ὧν in B.

476 D ΣΩ. τοῦτων δὲ ὁμολογουμένων, τὸ δίκην δίδοναι πότερον πάσχειν τί ἐστιν ἢ ποιεῖν; ΠΩ. ἀνάγκη, ὃ Σώκρατες, πάσχειν.

This stands very awkwardly for ἀνάγκη (αὐτὸ) πάσχειν (εἶναι). We shall do better

to write ἀνάγκη. Cf. Prot. 357 B ἐπεὶ δὲ μετρητικὴ (ἐστιν), ἀνάγκη δὴπον τέχνη καὶ ἐπιστήμη; [Xen.] R.A. 3. 7 ἀνάγκη τοῖνυν... ὀλέγοι ἐν ἐκάστῳ ἔσονται τῷ δικαστηρίῳ.

481 C εἰ... τις (πῶς τις Cobet) ἡμῶν ἴδιον τι ἔπασχεν πάθος ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι.

It is difficult to believe that Plato wrote ἴδιον... ἢ. One would expect ἴδια διαφέρειν or ἴδια ἕτερον... ἢ or ἴδιον... πάθος <ἕτερον> ἢ.

484 A καταπατήσας τὰ ἡμέτερα γράμματα καὶ μαγγανέματα καὶ ἐπωδὰς καὶ νόμους τοῖς παρὰ φύσιν ἅπαντας.

For γράμματα Valckenaer conjectured περιάμματα, Cobet πλάσματα. Observing just above κατεπαδόντες τε καὶ γοητεύοντες, I think γοητεύματα may be the word. Cf. Hesychius (quoted in Thompson's note) μάγαν· φάρμακα, δίκτυα, γοητεύματα. Plato is fond of γόης and its derivatives.

491 C νῦν δ' αὖ ἕτερόν τι ἦκεν ἔχων· ἀνδρείωτεροί τινες ὑπὸ σοῦ λέγονται οἱ κρείττους.

For ἔχων read λέγων, comparing 518 A ἦκεῖς δὲ ὀλίγον ὑστέρον λέγων κ.τ.λ.

In Phaedrus 232 A Badham's ἔχειν for λέγειν is adopted by Schanz, and the latter himself changes ἔχοιμ' ἂν ib. 272 C to λέγοιμ' ἂν. So in Menex. 243 A λέγουσι has been plausibly conjectured for ἔχουσι, and in Menander *Fragn.* 482 (Kock) παύσασθε νοῖν ἔχοντες.

493 A This passage will be greatly improved, if we insert ὅτι or something similar before τυγχάνει and put a comma instead of a full stop after κάτω. τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς τοῦτο is then resumed in καὶ τοῦτο and becomes the object of ἀνόμασε. The words τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς... κάτω, as they stand, are very pointless as something that Socrates learnt from a wise man along with the doctrine of σώμα σῆμα. What he learnt is contained in διὰ τὸ ... πῖθον, a play upon words parallel to the other.

496 E λυπούμενον χαίρειν λέγεις ἅμα, ὅταν διψῶντα πίνειν λέγῃς... ἢ οὐχ ἅμα τοῦτο γίνεται κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον καὶ χρόνον εἴτε ψυχῆς εἴτε σώματος βούλει;

If we read χρόνον καὶ τόπον, the genitives will have something to depend upon.

506 A λέγω μέντοι ταῦτα, εἰ δοκεῖ χρῆναι διαπερανθῆναι τὸν λόγον· εἰ δὲ μὴ βούλεισθε, ἔωμιν δὴ χαίρειν.

Both the context and the form of this sentence call imperatively for λέξω, like δίδειμι five lines above. Or it might be ἐρῶ, which is also confused with λέγω.



509 B πολλή ἀνάγκη ταύτην εἶναι τὴν αἰσχίστην βοήθειαν, μὴ δύνασθαι βοηθεῖν μήτε αὐτῷ μήτε τοῖς αὐτοῦ φίλοις τε καὶ οἰκείοις.

It is not difficult to see what has happened here, and the extensive omissions proposed are not at all necessary. The copyist has been misled by the coming βοθεῖν into writing βοήθειαν for another word, which word can hardly be anything but ἀδυναμίαν. Cf. 522 D εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐμέ τις ἐξελέγχοι ταύτην τὴν βοήθειαν ἀδύνατον ὄντα ἐμαντῷ καὶ ἄλλῳ βοηθεῖν, αἰσχυνομένην ἄν...καὶ, εἰ δὲ ταύτην τὴν ἀδυναμίαν ἀποθνήσκουμι, ἀγανακτοῖν ἄν. Cf. on *Prot.* 327 C.

511 E εἰδὼς ὅτι οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς βελτίους ἐξεβίβασεν ἢ οἱ ἐνέβησαν.

B and T give οἱ; οἱοι is supplied by the second hand in T. Schanz after Winckelmann adopts οἱ, which I confess seems to me very dubious. Would it not be better to read simply ἢ ἐνέβησαν, taking the pronouns as added to explain?

525 B οἱ μὲν ὠφελομένοι τε καὶ δίκην δίδοντες ὑπὸ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων.

The stress being on ὠφελομένοι, the fact that punishment is for their own good, it would seem that we ought to omit τε καὶ and make δίκην δίδοντες subordinate to ὠφελομένοι, 'benefited by receiving punishment': or, perhaps better, read something like ὠφελομένοι <κολαζόμενοι> τε καὶ δίκην δίδοντες.

ib. E Is not something lost after ἐξῆν αὐτῷ?

I add a few things which need no or almost no comment.

456 B Read καὶ (for καὶ) εἰς πόλιν. Cf. Schanz, *Novae Commentationes* p. 102. So in 482 B we want κρείττον <ἀν> εἶναι, as χορηγοῖν shows.

465 D ἀκρίτων ὄντων τῶν τε ἱατρικῶν καὶ ὑγεινῶν καὶ ὀψοποικῶν <καὶ ἡδέων>?

468 E ὅ τι δοκοῖ (or δοκοῖ)? In 469 E δοκοῖ must, I think, be right and ἄν is either to be omitted, or possibly changed to δῆ.

469 A οὔτε τοὺς ἀζηλώτους ζηλοῖν οὔτε τοὺς ἀθλοῦς <εὐδαιμονίζειν>? cf. 473 C.

473 E-474 A Omit the second ἐπισηφίζειν. So in 523 C omit the second κρίνονται.

486 B Perhaps μὴ τι αὐτὸν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.

509 A δόξειαν?

519 B Insert εἰ, either as Heindorf suggested, after πάσχουσιν or before ἄρα.

# HIPPIAS MAIOR.

281 A Ἰππίας ὁ καλὸς τε καὶ σοφός, ὥς διὰ χρόνον ἡμῖν κατήρας εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας.

The first words are, I imagine, taken to be a nominative doing duty as vocative, like *Symp.* 218 B οἱ οἰκέται...πύλας τοῖς ὥσιν ἐπίθεσθε: *Ar. Ach.* 242 πρῶτ' εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν ὀλίγον, ἢ κανηφόρος. But, though the grammars fail to tell us so, this nominative with the article (quite distinct from ὁ φίλος, ὁ κάκιστ' ἀπολούμενος, etc. and also distinct from e.g. *Ar. Av.* 30 ὄνδρες οἱ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ,) is only used with an imperative, expressed or understood, or with something equivalent to an imperative, or now and then with a question. Examples with the imperative expressed are given above. The imperative is understood in *Ar. Ach.* 54 (οἱ τοξόται), 61, 94 (something like ἔλκετε αὐτὸν in 54 and πρῶτε in 61, 94). In *Ach.* 824 ἀγορανόμοι, τοὺς συκοφάντας οὐ θύραζ' ἐξείρξετε; and 864 οἱ σφήκες, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν θυρῶν; the equivalence of οὐ with the second person of the future to an imperative is familiar. The last example therefore should not be written οἱ σφήκες οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν θυρῶν; as though the verb understood was in the third person. Finally, just as πρὸς θεῶν goes with an imperative, but goes also with a question, where we may if we like supply mentally something like *tell me*, so we may occasionally find such a phrase as *Ar. Av.* 1628 ὁ Τρίβαλλος, οἰμῶζειν δοκεῖ σοι; What is common to all these varieties of phrase is that some one is addressed suddenly. In the passage before us the presence of the nominative Ἰππίας, and that coming first certainly makes a difference. At the same time the words are by no means equivalent to an ordinary vocative (ὦ Ἰππία everywhere else in the dialogue). They seem rather to be a wondering question, *Is this Hippias?* and should perhaps be punctuated off from what follows. At the beginning of the *Symposium* the words of the friend are perhaps ὦ (not ὦ) Φαληρεῦς, οὗτος Ἀπολλόδορος, οὐ περιμενεῖς; or ὦ Φαληρεῦς οὗτος, Ἀπολλόδορος, οὐ περιμενεῖς; like *Ach.* 824 and 864 quoted above.

*Ibid.* Elis chooses Hippias as envoy, ἡγουμένη δικαστὴν καὶ ἄγγελον ἱκανώτατον εἶναι τῶν λόγων οἱ ἂν παρὰ τῶν πόλεων ἐκάστων λέγονται.

Δικαστὴν is obviously wrong, and neither Burges' διατηρῆν nor Naber's δοκιμαστὴν is a satisfactory correction. I venture to suggest ἀκρατὴν, though it is further from the MSS, and though I cannot account for the corruption, unless δικαστὴν was the

conjectural emendation of a half-erased word. Hippias seems to be alluding to his retentive memory (285 ε). The word ἄγγελον shows that his functions are mainly those of a reporter.

283 A The old conjecture, ἀνόητα for ἀνόητα, well deserves consideration.

290 B εἴπερ χρυσοῖν γε δὴ ὄν κ.τ.λ. Stallbaum explains the neuter, referring to τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, by saying it is as though τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς preceded. The simple explanation is that Athena is a statue, ἀγαλμα. In speaking of statues Pausanias constantly violates strict concord the other way, e.g. 4. 31. 7 Διοσκούρων ἀγάλματα, φέροντες κ.τ.λ.

295 D ἀποβλέποντες πρὸς ἑαστον αὐτῶν ἢ πέφυκεν ἢ εἰργασται ἢ κείται. Should it not be δαίκεται? cf. 286 A

## ION.

530 C οὐ γὰρ ἂν γένοιτό ποτε ῥαψωδός, εἰ μὴ συνέη κ.τ.λ.

There is no proper subject for γένοιτο and the meaning seems to me otherwise inadequately expressed. One would expect something like οὐ γὰρ ἂν γένοιτό ποτε ῥαψωδός <οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός>. Cf. the τοῦτο καλῶς ποιεῖν following.

A few lines below should not ὥς οὔτε be ὥστ' οὔτε? ὥς can hardly mean ὥστε here, and ὥς since takes the thing too quietly for granted.

531 B πότερον σὺ κάλλιον ἂν ἐξηγγασαιο ἢ τῶν μάντεων τις τῶν ἀγαθῶν; ION. τῶν μαντέων.

Add τις in the answer. The genitive must have something to depend on.

532 A τὸν μὲν εὖ γε, τοὺς δὲ χεῖρον.

Γε is quite out of place and should be omitted as in the *Marcianus*.

532 D σοφοὶ μὲν πού ἐστε ἡμεῖς..., ἐγὼ δὲ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ τάληθῇ λέγω, οἷον εἰκὸς ἰδιώτην ἀνθρώπων. ἐπεὶ...θίασαι ὡς φαῖλον καὶ ἰδιωτικὸν ἐστὶ καὶ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς γινῶναι ὃ ἔλεγον.

τάληθῇ cannot be right. *Hipp. Mai.* 288 D is not parallel, though we might be tempted to argue from it. The meaning obviously required here is *commonplace*, *trivial*, corresponding to the φαῖλον &c. following. Schanz reads εὐθήθῃ, but that means *foolish* and goes much too far. Madvig's τὰ πλῆθῃ, though at first sight tempting, is not really quite what we want, especially with οἷον εἰκὸς ἰδιώτην ἀνθρώπων. I would suggest what is farther from the MSS. but more in place here, εὐτελεῇ or τὰ εὐτελεῇ.

In Xen. *Cyneget.* 12. 7 I have suggested that ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (παιδεύεσθαι) should be ἐν εὐτελείᾳ.

536 B ἐπειδὴν μὲν τίς <τι> ἄλλον του ποιητοῦ ᾄδῃ.

Schanz is probably right in inserting τι, but *Wasps* 269 may be quoted in support of the ellipse: ἡγείτ' ἂν ᾄδων Φρυγίχου.

## MENEXENUS.

234 A Omit καὶ before ἀπό, and 237 A insert τήν before τροφήν.

237 C In this very carefully composed oration it is difficult to accept such an anacoluthon as the infinitive κείσθαι. It seems much more probable that a participle parallel to ἀποφηναιμένη and governing κείσθαι has been omitted, e.g. παρέχονσα or ἑῷσα. Or we might insert ὥστε before καὶ νῦν.

238 C Omit the first ἀριστοκρατίᾳ (after καὶ νῦν). The force of the passage will be greatly enhanced by the name being kept to the end.

239 C τούτων περί μοι δοκεῖ χρῆναι ἐπιμνησθῆναι ἐπαυνοῦντά τε καὶ προμνόμενον ἄλλοις ἐς ὧδ' αὖτε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ποίησιν αὐτὰ θεῖναι πρεπόντως τῶν πραξάντων.

Should not ἄλλοις be ἄλλους? Jebb *ad Soph. O.C.* 1075 explains these words to mean 'commending them and wooing them for others (i.e. for the poets), with a view to their putting them into verse.' But does Plato (if it is Plato) mean that the poet woos the subject or that the subject woos the poet? He has just said that the subject ἐτι ἐστὶν ἐν μνηστείᾳ, which I suppose in point of Greek might mean either. If the poet woos the subject, then the speaker ought to mean that a certain number of poets are actually addressing themselves to it, which it is plain was not the case. Also the orator's 'wooing for others' would consist (I suppose) in his giving a sort of rhetorical treatment by way of anticipation of the more elevated poetical treatment to come. But how forced, obscure and false all this is! and how awkward the infinitive θεῖναι! Surely it is the subject that woos or invites poets to treat it. It has been courting poetical treatment for a long time past and is courting it still (ἐτι ἐστὶν ἐν μνηστείᾳ; the *Persae* seems strangely forgotten or undervalued). The orator will add his efforts and on its behalf woo the poets to put it into verse. This certainly seems the sense and the accusative ἄλλους would then appear to be necessary, as there is no reason why

the person wooed or invited should be in the dative. In Xen. *An.* 7. 3. 18 τοιαῦτα προῖμ-νᾶτο ἐκάστῳ προσίῳν the dative may very well go with προσίῳν.

244 c διανοομένη δὲ ἡ πόλις μὴ ἂν ἔτι ἀμύναι μήθ' Ἑλληνιστ. κ.τ.λ.

On ἂν Schanz remarks *addubito*. There is probably no example forthcoming of ἂν with a tense after διανοοῦμαι *resolve*, be *minded*, for we must distinguish this from the sense *think*, *suppose*. If then ἂν is wrong, we might perhaps substitute the emphatic δῆ. Cf. *Iliad.* 10. 447 μὴ δῆ μοι φέξιν γε, Δόλων, ἐμβάλλεο θυμῷ: *Dem.* 18. 11 οὐ δῆ ποιήσω τοῦτο: *Thuc.* 7. 71. 7 ἦν τε... οὐδεμῶς δῆ... ἐλάσσω ἐκπληξίς. The confusion of AN and ΔH is familiar.

245 A Μαραθῶνι καὶ Σαλαμῖνι καὶ Πλαταιαῖς.

Perhaps κἂν Σαλαμῖνι. Σαλαμῖνι and Πλαταιαῖς are probably never used as locatives like Μαραθῶνι. The locative of Πλαταιαῖς is Πλαταιαῖσι.

245 B τειχισαμένη δὲ καὶ ναυπηγησαμένη, ἐκδεξαμένη τὸν πόλεμον, ἐπειδὴ ἡναγκάσθη πολέμῳ, ὑπὲρ Παρίων ἐπολέμει Λακεδαιμονίους.

ὑπὲρ Παρίων is a great difficulty as Athens certainly did not wage war at the time referred to on behalf of Paros. The only states that could very well be mentioned would be Thebes or Corinth, and it is not apparent how Θηβαίων or Κορινθίων could have been so corrupted. But it is not really very natural to say that Athens waged war *on behalf of* anybody, if she was forced into it (ἡναγκάσθη). The two things are not exactly incompatible, but they do not go very readily together. I should therefore look rather for something descriptive of the war or its conduct, and ὑπὲρ Παρίων might disguise an adverb in -ως. It has however occurred to me whether the words are not a corruption of ὑπερόριον. If the π had been repeated by error, ὑπερόριον might easily change into ὑπὲρ Παρίων. But this is a mere possibility. Cf. *Dem.* 18. 241 πόλεμος ὁμορος, &c.

249 AB The anacoluthon of the infinitive ἀρχεσθαι is quite as awkward as that of κείσθαι in 237 c, and, like that, calls for the addition of a participle, e.g. βουλομένη. In any case the sentence is a cumbersome one, the participles being already in excess.

The last letters of ἐπιτηδεύματα seem to have absorbed a τὰ which is necessary to ὄργανα.

## CLITOPHON.

408 B Read δικαστική τε καὶ δικαιοσύνη.

There is no possible construction for the accusative.

408 C For ὅπως δέει we should expect ὅπως δῆ δέει or ὅπως ἂν δέη.

## ALCIBIADES I.

110 B σὺ δ' εἰ τύχοις ἀγνοῶν εἶτ' ἀδικοῖο εἶτε μὴ τότε λέγεις τί σε χρὴ ποιεῖν;

This refers to past time. 'Do you mean, what were you to do if (i.e. whenever) you did not know?' Read therefore χρὴν for χρῆ.

111 D ὁρθῶς ἂν αὐτὸν πέμπουσιν εἰς διδασκαλίαν τούτων τῶν πολλῶν.

πέμπειν (φοιτᾶν) εἰς τινός is the regular phrase, the suppressed substantive being not διδασκαλία but οἰκία or an equivalent. Whether or no such a phrase as πέμπειν εἰς διδασκαλίαν τινός is possible, I should conjecture εἰς τούτων to be right here.

112 B ταῦτα <τὰ> ποιήματα.

So in 117 D probably τὰ ἀμαρτήματα <τὰ> ἐν τῇ πράξει.

117 A For διὰ ταῦτα read διὰ τοῦτο.

So τοῦτ' αἴτιον just above.

119 E Socrates says ironically πᾶν σοὶ ἄρα ἀξίον ἀγαπᾶν, εἰ τῶν στρατιωτῶν βελτίων εἶ, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τοὺς τῶν ἀντιπάλων ἡγεμόνας ἀποβλέπειν, ὅποτε ἐκείνων βελτίων γέγονας σκοποῦντα καὶ ἀσκοῦντα πρὸς ἐκείνους.

The last clause is obviously wrong, and Schanz cites two or three essays at emendation, e.g. Heindorf's ὅπη τε ἐκείνων βελτίων γένοιτο. I think the error is in ἐκείνων or ἐκείνους, one being an accidental repetition of the other. We should read either ὅποτε τούτων or πρὸς τούτους. The meaning is 'since you are now better than the former, thinking of and training yourself for the latter.' Alcibiades' rejoinder is λέγεις δὲ τίνας τούτους; which is, I think, consistent with either change, though it may seem to favour the second.

123 B πρὸς τοὺς Περσικοὺς (πλούτους) καὶ <τὸν> τοῦ ἐκείνων βασιλέως.

124 B οὗτοι εἰσὶν <οἱ> ἀντίπαλοι ἀλλ' οὐχ οὗς σὺ οἶε.

ιβ. D ἐπιμελείας δεόμεθα, μᾶλλον μὲν πάντες ἄνθρωποι, ἀτὰρ νῶ γε καὶ πᾶν σφόδρα.

μᾶλλον μὲν is devoid of meaning, and I conjecture μᾶλλον to be a mistake for πολλῆς. 'We need care, a good deal all of us, but you and I very much indeed.' Cf.

*Symp.* 178 A θαυμαστός...πολλαχῇ μὲν καὶ ἄλλῃ, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ κ.τ.λ.

127 B δοκεῖ καὶ κατὰ τοῦτ' <αὐτ'> αὐτοῖς φίλια ἐγγίγνεσθαι.

ib. D εἰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸ ἦσθον πεπονήτως <ὦν> πενηκονταετής!

134 C οὐκ ἄρα ἐξουσίαν σοι οὐδ' ἀρχὴν παρασκευαστέον παντὶ ποιεῖν ὅτι ἂν βούλη.

ἐξουσία can take an infinitive after it (power to do) as in E below, not so ἀρχήν. The two words should therefore change places, οὐκ ἄρα ἀρχήν σοι οὐδ' ἐξουσίαν. Cf. on *Gorg.* 496 E above.

## ALCIBIADES II.

138 E οὐκ οἶε τοὺς θεοὺς, ἃ τυγχάνομεν εὐχόμενοι καὶ ἰδία καὶ δημοσίᾳ, ἐνίοτε τούτων τὰ μὲν δίδοναι, τὰ δ' οὐ, καὶ ἔστιν οἷς μὲν αὐτῶν, ἔστιν δ' οἷς οὐ; αὐτῶν is incompatible with the first person τυγχάνομεν. Should we read αὐ? We might think of αὐ τῶν <εὐχομένων>, but this seems unlikely.

A few lines below αὐτοῖς also seems wrong, because quite pointless. Perhaps αὐτῶ. So in 146 B ἂν μὲν πράττη ἃ τις οἶδεν the subject of πράττη anticipates τις.

143 E ἐλθόντα ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας εἰπεῖν εἰ ἔνδον ἐστί.

Nothing is wrong here, but εἰπεῖν is used in the late sense of *ask*, and this is one of the indications of date.<sup>1</sup> That sense is for instance found several times in Diogenes Laertius. Ar. *Rhet.* 2. 23. 1398 b 26 may seem at first sight to have it, but I think not.

144 B οἰηθείς ἂν MSS. Read perhaps οἰηθείς δῆ. Dobree conjectured δῆ for δεῖν after οἰηθῆναι in 144 D: cf. however 146 B.

145 B οὐδ' εἰ τίς τινα ἀποκτενεῖν οἶδεν οὐδὲ (read οὐδ' εἰ) χρήματα ἀφαιρεῖσθαι.

146 B C οὐκοῦν καί, ἂν μὲν πράττη ἃ τις οἶδεν ἢ δοκεῖ εἰδέναι, παρέπεται δὲ τὸ ὠφελίμως, καὶ λυσιτελοῦντως ἡμᾶς ἔξιν καὶ τῇ πόλει καὶ αὐτὸν αὐτῶ. παρέπεται B, παρέπεται T. Schanz, whose punctuation I have reproduced. This gives very indifferent sense, and I should conjecture παρέπεται (or παρέπεσθαι governed by what precedes) δῆ τὸ ὠφελίμως καὶ λυσιτελοῦντως κ. τ. λ., only that ἡμᾶς is

<sup>1</sup> Others are the words κεκορηκότα 141 B: ἥπερ for ἥ 141 D, 142 C, 149 A: φάμενοι 142 D and φάντες 146 B: κτήμα for κτήσις 144 D and 146 E: ἀποκριθῆναι 149 B: perhaps τυχόν = ἴσως 140 A and 150 C, and τὸ παρῆκον, the present 148 C: also ὁπότεν ὁράης 146 A, if the author wrote this and not ὁπότε.

impossible. Possibly ἡμῖν, as a dative *ethicus*. (Dr. Postgate calls attention to a certain verbal similarity with *Gorg.* 470 A).

147 A B ἄρ' οὐχὶ τῷ ὄντι δικαίως πολλῶ χειμῶνι χρήσεται, ἅτε οἶμαι ἄνευ κυβερνήτου διατελῶν ἐν πελάγει, χρόνον οὐ μακρὸν βίον θέων (so Stephanus: βίον θέων B: βίον θεῶν T). Schanz reads πλέον for θέων, mentioning πρὸς βίαν θέων and βιοτεύων as other conjectures. I would suggest that θέων is quite right but should change places with διατελῶν. For θεῖν of persons at sea cf. Xen. *Hell.* 6. 2. 29 θέοντες ἅμα ἀνεπαύοντο, and Xenophon several times has διατελεῖν as a transitive verb with βίον, χρόνον, ἔτη etc. (Dr. Postgate suggests to me that διατελῶν is a gloss on θέων).

148 A μάργον τί μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς πολλῆς φυλακῆς.

μάργον is absurdly out of place. I conjecture ἀργαλέον *difficult* a word rare in prose, but we may go again to Xenophon and to Aristophanes, nor in this dialogue does it much matter. (Dobree thought ἔργον or μέγα ἔργον might do.)

150 C ἵνα μὴδ' should, I think, be ἵνα μὴ.

## HIPPARCHUS.

226 E The construction of γλίεσθαι with an accusative is so questionable that perhaps an infinitive e.g. κτήσασθαι, has been omitted, governing the accusatives and itself governed by γλίσχοντα.

229 C The death of Hipparchus did not come about (Socrates says) διὰ τὴν τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἀτιμίαν τῆς κατηφορίας. Whose sister? Grammar would point to Hipparchus. Has not Ἀρμόδιον been omitted?

230 A Socrates offers to withdraw various propositions. Of the last of them, that gain is good, his friend says οὔτι πᾶν γε τοῦτί μοι ἀνάθου. I cannot find that any editor has had scruples about either the sense or the grammar of this. Yet οὔτι is impossible with an imperative, nor in the context does such a sentence make proper sense, since what the man wants to say is not that some gain is good, but that some is not. Can anything be clearer than that we should point it οὔτι πᾶν γε τοῦτί μοι ἀνάθου?

230 B Read ταῦτὸν (for ταῦτὰ) ὄντα just as ταῦτὸ stands two lines below.

## ERASTAE.

134 E Read καὶ τοῦτου <πέρι> τὸν γεωργὸν ὁμολογοῦμεν.





(14-22). What then? Look at their lives. Men say their motive for hoarding and amassing is the Ant's—a prudent regard for the future. But it is not: for, unlike the Ant, they never stop to enjoy their savings. It is greed' (28-40). Horace does not indeed say this totidem uerbis. He assumes continuity in his subject, and he takes for granted that his readers will recognise the person described in 39 *sqq.* 'cum te neque feruidus aestus | demoneat lucro neque hiemps ignis mare ferrum | nil obstat tibi, dum ne sit te ditior alter. | quid inuat immensum te argenti pondus et auri | furtim defossa timidum deponere terra?' as an *avarus*. From 41 onwards to 100 he lashes the folly of the vice; and in 101 *sqq.* he guards himself from possible misconstruction by saying that he does not inculcate extravagance when he condemns—what? 'non ego *avarum* | cum ueto te fieri, uappam iubeo ac nebulonem.' From this digression he now 'returns' to his 'point of departure.' What is this? Why, that avarice is the cause of the universal discontent. This is the conclusion of the whole matter; and it must be put in clear and emphatic terms. The reading *nemo ut avarus* fails from this point of view also: for with it, *avarus* cannot be separated from *nemo*, and though it be true that no *avarus* is contented with himself, that is not the point here. *quod nemo, ut avarus*, which some one has proposed, is better; but it is open to the objection that *ut* 'seeing that' is not strong enough for the present passage. We want a particle which definitely means *because*. On these grounds I should prefer to read '*nemo ut, quia avarus, se probet.*' 'I return to my point, how that no one is contented *because* he is avaricious.' The ellipse of *sit* belongs to colloquial style; cf. vi. 8 'dum ingenuus' (*sit*), *ib.* 53 'quod te sortitus amicum' (*sim*). It remains to explain the MS. variants. The *a* of '*quia*' was lost before '*avarus*,' and *qui* was displaced; hence it appears before *nemo* in the Blandinian. The '*nemone*' of the vulgate may be, as others suppose, a metrical correction of *nemo ut* (*qui* having been lost). But *qui* and *ne* are variant readings at Caesar B. G. 7. 45. 7.

In iii. 9 *sqq.*

nil aequale homini fuit illi: saepe uelut qui currebat fugiens hostem; persaepe uelut qui Iunonis sacra ferret; habebat saepe ducentos, saepe decem seruos *e.g.s.*

Editors one after the other explain the

brachylogy as follows 'saepe currebat uelut qui fugiens hostem <*curreret*>, saepe <*incedebat*> uelut qui Iunonis sacra ferret'; and there an end. But a legitimate curiosity has much more to ask. It desires to know first what warrant there is for supplying the subjunctive *curreret* out of the indicative *currebat*; and indeed what ground there is for supplying *curreret* at all, beyond the circumstance that *ferret* follows. But it pushes inquisitiveness further and would fain know what sense there is in *curreret* when so supplied.

There are two modes of comparing an action in progress with some other action. First you may compare *two actors*; you may say that Tigellius runs like a man <sup>(who runs)</sup> <sub>(running)</sub> in full flight from an enemy; or, in Latin, with ellipse of one of the *currit*'s, 'saepe uelut qui fugiens hostem currit.' The two *currit*'s have not exactly the same meaning; for one is general and the other particular. But even we feel no difficulty about that. And, when the comparison is transferred to the past, though we hesitate to write 'Tigellius ran like a man *who ran*' this feeling must not be ascribed to the Roman, to whom it was natural to think of connected actions as falling within the same sphere of time.

This is the form which Horace had in his mind in the first sentence. Tigellius ran 'uelut qui *currit*,' or, 'with mental accommodation of the tense, 'uelut qui *currebat* fugiens hostem.' This mode of comparison requires the Indicative.

You may also adopt another mode of comparison. You may compare *two actions* of the same actor. You can say a present action is *like* a non-present, or imagined action; you can say accordingly, that Tigellius 'ran as if he were running from an enemy.' This mode of comparison requires the Subjunctive.

But you cannot combine the two. You must not attempt to say that 'he ran as a man who *might be* running away' nor 'he ran like the sort of man who *would run* away,' or anything else that may be devised to represent *qui* with the subjunctive. Why? Because you must not treat the comparison which you are drawing in order to make your thought clear to the reader, in the spirit of the Atheist's Prayer, 'O God, if there be a God, save my soul if I have a soul.' It is the task of those who deny this proposition to substantiate their denial: it is ours to restore coherence to the text of Horace. This task is happily easy. We

have only to observe that the second *uelut qui* has come from the first which stands immediately above it, and that Horace wrote *uelut si*, as at vi. 66 in exactly the same place of the verse.

It may perhaps be inquired why should Horace have varied the expression? A sufficient answer is, 'Being a poet, why should he not?' It may however be pointed out that the variation is appropriate. In accordance with usage in such matters the sacred emblems of the goddess Juno were carried by *women*: cp. Ov. Am. 3, 13, 27 sq. 'more patrum Graio uelatae uestibus albis | tradita supposito uertice sacra ferunt' and Hor. Serm. II. viii. 13 sq. When then Horace makes Tigellius walk, *as if* he were bearing the sacred emblems of Juno, he is clothing his meaning in the most appropriate garb that can be devised.

iii. 59 sq.

hic fugit omnes  
insidias nullique malo latus *obdit* apertum

I have already challenged the legitimacy of the current interpretation of this passage in a few lines published in the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* for 1895, p. 9; but as the brief protest appears to have been overlooked, I ask leave to expand it here.

Every commentator upon this passage known to me understands *obdit* as equivalent to 'obicit' 'offert' 'opponit,' and as meaning the man 'exposes' his flank to no evil or no enemy. But first there is *no other* passage in Latin where the verb has this meaning or anything approaching to it; and secondly, although it is true that there is a certain resemblance in the use of several compounds of *-do* and the corresponding compounds of *pono*, such resemblance is neither so strong nor so all-pervading as to form a valid ground for argument. If e.g. many of the usages of 'addo' suggest 'adpono' and many of 'condo' 'compono,' those of 'trado' are far removed from those of 'transpono' and 'reddo' shows few which recall 'repono.'

This rarest of all the compounds of *do* is very limited and almost technical in sense. It is almost exclusively used of barring a door by means of *pessuli* or *serae*; e.g. 'pessuli foribus'—or 'fores pessulis obduntur.' In the first phrase 'opponuntur' is possible but not in the second. And only the second concerns us here. For 'obdere fores' may be quoted Pliny N.H. 6, 30 'fores *obditae* ferratis trabibus' (of the *portae Caesariae*), Ovid, Fasti 1, 279 sqq.

'ut populo reditus pateant ad bella profecto, | tota patet dempta ianua nostra sera. | pace *fores obdo*, ne qua discedere possit; | Caesareoque diu nomine clausus ero.' Plautus Cas. 893 'forem obdo.' As in all these passages and in other places MSS. corrupt the verb to the commoner *addo obdo* we should read 'obde forem' at Ov. Ars. Am. 3, 587 (uulg. 'adde') and Val. Fl. 2, 236 'obduntque domos' (uulg. 'adduntque'). But if of itself 'latus obdit' could hardly mean anything but 'bars' or 'closes' his side, a fortiori must it mean this when it is connected with *apertum*. Compare Ter. Haut. 276 'anus quaedam prodit; haec ubi *aperit* ostium | continuo hic se coniecit intro, ego consequor. | *anus foribus obdit pessulum* (that is, obdit fores), ad lanam redit.<sup>1</sup> We must then 'dare to be wise' and connect 'nulli malo' with 'apertum' and not with 'obdit.' Grammatically indeed it might be taken with 'obdit' as in Ov. Ex Pont. 2, 2, 42 'nec rigidam timidus uocibus obde forem.' But then it would be an admirable description of a man who is 'ineautus.'

iii. 88 sqq.

fugis ut Rusonem debitor aeris,  
qui, nisi cum tristes misero venere Kalendae,  
*mercedem aut nummos* unde unde extricat,  
amaras  
porrecto iugulo historias, captiuus ut, audit.

The words in italics are explained to mean that the unfortunate debtor had to provide either the interest or the *capital*. He might have to provide both, but let that pass. What is not explained is why the capital should be 'coin' and the 'interest' not? We are only within our rights when we ask why, if this was his meaning, Horace did not write 'aut sortem aut mercedem.'

Let us try another path. Horace is describing what happens to the victims of the literary moneylender when the dreaded kalends come round (*cum* frequentative with the perfect). He must produce the interest, *that is* the cash; or he must listen to the compositions. Why then, when the meaning is so obvious, has interpretation gone so long astray? The words exclude the hendiadys which the sense demands. I have searched

<sup>1</sup> It seems not impossible that the phrase *fores obdere* is in part an imitation of the Greek ἐπιδείναι θύρας: cf. Plato, Symp. 218 B πύλας πάντο μὲγάλας τοῖς ὡρίν ἐπιδείσθαι, Seneca Ep. 31. 2 'ad summam sapiens eris si cluseris aures' (the *obseratae aures* of Horace), quibus ceram parum est *obdere*, firmiore spissamento opus est quam in sociis usum Vlixem ferunt.

in vain for a similar use of *aut*, and the unconscious witness of the commentators, to whom it has never presented itself as a possibility, is an indication not without weight that my search was foredoomed to failure; *aut* then must go and *et* take its place. Of the confusion of the two conjunctions in the manuscripts of Horace, no less than eleven instances are cited in Keller's *Epilegomena*.

## iv. 19 sqq.

at tu conclusas hircuinis follibus auras  
usque laborantes dum ferrum molliat ignis  
ut mauis, imitare.

On the strength of this passage it is frequently asserted, e.g. by Rich Dict. At. s.u. *follis*, Blümner *Technologie* ii. p. 191, that the ancients used the skin of the he-goat for making leathern bellows. But that this statement must be provided with a better foundation will presently appear. Certainly the usual material would seem to have been cow- or ox-hide; and we need not impute ignorance of this to the author of the *Georgics* because he has 'taurinis follibus' in 4, 171, observing that neither in quantity nor quality would 'bubuli folles' have suited his stately measure.

The expression here is metaphorical; and the *hircus* not the actual male of the goat, but a very different animal with whom the not over-delicate fancy of Roman poets not unseldom plays. Catull. 69, 5 sqq. 'laedit te quaedam mala fabula qua tibi fertur | ualle sub alarum trux habitare caper. | hunc metuunt omnes; neque mirum. nam mala ualde est | bestia.' Horace *Epod.* 12, 5, 'polypus an grauis hirsutis cubet hircus in alis.' As the *follis* are the labouring lungs of the energetic reciter (*Pers.* 5, 11, *Juv.* 7, 111), so is the *hircus* the accompaniment of his exertions. There is a like sarcastic play on *ala* in a very similar connexion, *Juv.* Sat. 10, 178 'madidis cantat quae Sostratus alis,' which is a parody of such expressions as 'madidis Notus euolat alis' *Ov. Met.* 1, 264 (wrongly regarded by Mayor as a mere coincidence in language), and the same pun occurs with *alae hircuinæ* in Plautus *Poen.* 871 sqq.

There is a curious verbal parallel to our expression in Pliny if the Moneus is right, *N.H.* 12, § 81 'ad hunc (ex aris fumum atque nidorem) ergo sanandum Sabaei styracem in follibus petunt hircinis suffiuntque tecta. adeo nulla est uoluptas quae non adisuitate fastidium pariat.' The other MSS. have urunt styracem in pellibus hircinis, with the same sense 'pouches.'

NO. CXXXIV. VOL. XV.

## iv. 32.

ne quid  
summa deperdat metuens aut ampliut ut  
rem.

The compound *deperdere* has two senses: (1) to lose away, i.e. entirely, (2) destroy completely. In neither sense can it take a simple ablative. Here, then, either it is an 'imperfect' or, if you like, 'spurious' compound, in which the preposition does all the work of regimen, as in 'rostra aduolare' and other well-known examples of this survival from an earlier stage in language; or else, what seems a better solution, the *de* must be separated from the *perdat* and made to govern the substantive itself. This certainly should be done with *desurgat* at ii. 2, 76 'uides ut pallidus omnis | cena de surgat dubia?' a place where I formerly wrongly defended the compound (in the technical sense) for Horace although denying it for Lucretius (*V.* 703).<sup>1</sup> Examples of the postponement will be found in Neue *IL* 2 789 sqq. and a number in Munro on *Lucr.* I. 841. The mobility of prepositions is, it may be added, a well-known feature of Greek; and these uses may be partly Graecisms.

## v. 73 sq.

nam uaga per ueterem dilapso flamma  
culinam  
Volcanosumum properabat lambere tectum.

The smoke from the burning 'kitchen' seems to have blinded the commentators, for example, Palmer, who writes 'dilapso Volcano means that the fire fell in pieces and that the logs of which it was composed slipped out on to the kitchen floor.' But *culinam* does not mean a 'kitchen' here; but a cooking stove or range which, being worn out (*ueterem*), fell to pieces and scattered the burning coals (*dilapso Volcano*) over the wooden floor. That *culina* may be used in this sense is shown by the portable *culinae* of Seneca, *Ep.* 78. 23 and Juvenal, 3. 250.

## vi. 30 sqq.

ut si qui aegrotet quo morbo Barrus, haberi  
et cupiat formosus, eat quacumque, puellis

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of Philology*, 1891, p. 288. I learn from Prof. Merrill, who recently proposed the same separation for 'desurgere' in Lucretius, *American J. of Phil.* 1900, p. 185, that the correction is as old as Lambinus. In 'tanto emetiris aceruo' (*II* ii. 105) however, the abl. depends on the verb: for the compound is proper in this sense; see *Mon. Ancyr.* 3. 12.

iniciat curam quaerendi singula, quali  
sit facie, sura, quali pede, dente, capillo,  
sic e.q.s.

Whether the point of this comparison is understood by the editors, I cannot tell; but no note that I have read betrays that intelligence. Suffice it to say that the word *morbus* (Hor. *carm.* 1, 37 9 *sq.* and Catullus 57. 6 with the commentators there) and the pointed reference to female rivals (*puellis*, with the emphasis of the verse upon it, as in I. ii. 83, 86, iv. 76, vi. 79, 82, vii. 25, 26) shows that the attractiveness which Barrus desired was that of a *Δῆμος καλός* (Aristophanes) or a *formosus Alexis* (Virgil).

I have some doubt whether *iniciat curam* is right; *iniciat c u s a m* would correspond better with *cogit* (v. 37), and is more usual with the genitive of the gerund (Cic. *Caec.* 4), and the two words are often confused. But, as it may be argued that *curare* in v. 37 picks up *curam* here rather than *curae* in v. 34, I should not alter the text.

vi. 110 *sq.*

hoc ego commodius quam tu, praeclare  
senator,  
*milibus atque aliis, uiuo.*

It has long been observed that the Latin for 'thousands of other things' is *mille alia*, not *milia alia*, which is 'other thousands.' But nothing better than the weak '*multis atque aliis*' of Lambinus has been proposed. I believe *ATQVEALIS* to have been corrupted from *ETQVATIS*, and would accordingly read '*milibus et quantis*!' 'In this respect and in how many thousands am I better off!' '*quanta milia*' was conversational Latin for '*quot milia*'; compare Prop. 1. 5. 10 'at tibi curarum milia quanta dabit!'

viii.—Not a little error and confusion has been imported into the criticism and interpretation of this poem by a misapprehension of the structure of its exordium. Verses 8–16 constitute a parenthesis of some length, it is true, but are not on that account surprising from the author of the complicated sentence of Epist. I. xv. 1–25; and verses 3 *sqq.* and 17 *sqq.* are in close connexion. To prove this it is only necessary to print these verses in sequence with italic type to show their correspondences.

deus inde ego, *furum aviumque*  
maxima formido: nam *fures* dextra coercet  
obscaenoque ruber porrectus ab inguine  
palus;

ast importunas *uolucris* in uertice harundo  
terret fissa<sup>1</sup> uetatque nouis considerare in  
hortis: 7  
cum mihi non tantum *furesque feraeque*  
*suetae* 17  
hunc uexare locum curae sunt atque labori  
*quantum* carminibus *quae* uersant atque  
*uenenis*  
humanos animos: *has* nullo perdere possum  
nec prohibere modo e.q.s.

The peculiar humour of the piece can now be appreciated. Its *motif* is that against the witches the god of gardens found his ordinary terrors wholly unavailing, and accordingly had to discover a new device for self-protection.

The parenthesis explain the *nouis-hortis* of 7, and should be punctuated as follows:

(huc *prius* angustis eiecta cadavera cellis  
conseruus uili portanda locabat in arca;  
hoc miserae plebi stabat commune sepul-  
crum,  
Pantolabo scurrae Nomentanoque nepoti;  
mille pedes in fronte, trecentos cippus in  
agrum  
hic dabat, heredes monumentum ne seque-  
retur:  
nunc licet Esquiliiis habitare salubribus,  
atque  
aggere in aprico spatium qua<sup>2</sup> modo tristes  
albis informem spectabant ossibus agrum).

If it be asked why the twentieth century is with us before this has been perceived, the answer is at hand. There was a *nunc* in v. 14 and a *cum* in v. 17: and the accident of this vicinity has betrayed scholars into joining these particles in an illegitimate union. It is the same influence which at vii. 10 *sq.*

hoc etenim sunt omnes iure molesti,  
quo fortes, quibus aduersum bellum incidit

has beguiled a phalanx of commentators into coupling with the adverbial *iure* the *hoc* whose sole concern is with its correspondent *quo*. Kruger and Smart are the only editors known to me who have explained this passage correctly; to whom may since be added Dean Wickham, *Cl. Rev.* 1888, p. 40 b.

In two passages of this Satire, it is, I fear, still necessary to defend the MS. text.

<sup>1</sup> Fea's correction of the MS. *fissa* seems certain. Compare Prop. 4. 7. 25 'nec crepuit *fissa* me propter *harundine* custos' = *ὁ σχιζόμενος κάλαμος* Schol. on κρόταλον Ar. Nub. 259 (quoted by Rothstein). In this case the wind served as *custos* to rattle the *harundo*.

<sup>2</sup> *qua* Bentley, *quo* MSS.



uideres

infernus errare canes Lunamque rubentem,  
ne foret his testis, post magna latere  
sepulcra.

The MS. reading has been assailed on the ground that there were no tombs on the Esquiline. A reclaimed burial ground such as Horace describes would, it has been contended, contain no tombs, whether great or small.

Grant this; what then? Did Horace suppose that any one would understand him to mean that the Esquiline was of the exact dimensions of the burial ground, viz., 1000 feet frontage by 300 feet deep? Could not a writer on a penny steamboat in the Thames say that the moon hid behind Westminster Abbey or St. Stephen's without being supposed to mean that these buildings were floating tabernacles? That the 'great' *sepulcra* (or *sepulcrum*, for the plural need mean no more) lay outside the common burial ground was perceived by Kiessling, and that in Cicero's time noteworthy monuments might be placed on the Esquiline, is proved by the quotation from Cicero Phil. ix. 17 given in Orelli-Baiter-Mewes. There is no reason to suppose the 'magna sepulcra' to be of any unusual size. The indications of time in the scene point to moon-rise. 21 'simul ac uaga luna decorum | protulit os' and the ruddy colour of the moon,<sup>1</sup> in which Horace would have us see the hue of shame, both suggest that it was near the horizon and therefore needed no very lofty structure to conceal it.

41 singula quid memorem quo pacto alterna  
loquentes  
umbræ cum Sagana resonarent triste et acutum

I should not refer to this passage but for the amazing vitality of Bentley's error. In spite of *alterna loquentes* the world follows him in his attempt to reduce the imperfect to the level of 'ut—*abdiderint* furtim terris et imagine cerea | largior *arserit* ignis.' Syntax does not gain by the change: for the perfectly correct 'resonarent' compare 'video igitur causas esse permultas quæ istum impellerent. uideamus nunc, eaque facultas suscipiendi malefici fuerit Cicero pro Rosc. Am. 92; and style and accident receive a staggering blow. For the perfect

<sup>1</sup> It is not necessary to prove this, but a parallel from a magical scene, in a poem of T. G. Hake occurs to me while writing. 'The curious moon, half rising, interweaves In heaven a blood-red ray' (*The Palmist*).

resonauit Bentley did indeed cite Manilius V. 566: but the imperfect which I have restored (*Silua* Man. p. 54) is pictorially as necessary there as it is here, and the MSS. of Manilius are far more corrupt than those of Horace. Here it is enough to put the Latin into Greek. *resonarent* is ἠριζον, *abdiderint* κατέφυξαν, *arserit* ἔλαμψεν. For the last perfect we may compare Virg. G. 4. 384 'ter.. flamma *reliuiscit*' and similar expressions elsewhere, e.g. Prop. 3. 10. 20 '*lucuerit* (fut. perf.) et tota flamma secunda domo.' Palmer has an argument for *resonarint* which we must notice; '*resonui* is found nowhere.' If the normal perfect of a compound of *sono* be not found, it might well be argued that there was something in the meaning of that compound which discouraged its formation.

ix. 43.

Maecenas quomodo tecum?

hinc repetit. paucorum hominum et  
mentis bene sanæ:  
nemo dexterius fortuna est usus. haberes  
magnum adiutorem posset qui ferre secundas,  
hunc hominem uelles si tradere. dispeream  
ni  
submosses omnes.

It might have been thought a matter of common knowledge that in conditional sentences of the type before us the Latin imperfect and pluperfect indicate events which are either known or expected not to be realised. Yet this is the rendering of our passage by one of the most scholarly translators of Horace:

'*Twould be a good deed done if you could throw  
Your servant in his way; I mean, you know,  
Just to play second: in a month I'll swear,  
You'd make an end of every rival there.*'

CONINGTON.

and this is the elucidation which it receives in the last edition of one of the most meritorious commentaries that we have (the italics in both cases are mine): '*iam facile tibi erit mihi, homini centum artium, quales ille solet deligere, aditum ad eum parare ac facies hoc fortasse non sine proprio tuo commodo: ego enim te pro virili parte iuwarem aduersos inuidos atque iniquos tuos, qui ut reor interdum apud illum tibi officiant: immo ope mea quos uoles *summovebis**' (Orelli-Baiter-Mewes).<sup>2</sup> Confusion such as

<sup>2</sup> Other editors who misconstrue *haberes*—*uelles* or *submosses* or both are Heindorf, Kirchner, Fritzsche, Schütz, Palmer, Kiessling, L. Mueller and Wickham. The only commentator known to me who has shown that he understood any of these verbs correctly is Doederlein who corrects Heindorf's mistake about *submosses*.



this allows us no choice of path. We must set out from the elementary principles of Latin grammar and consider what meanings the imperfect and pluperfect tenses can or cannot have in conditional sentences. Firstly, they *cannot* refer to a future event if that event is regarded as possible. In this case the present and perfect are required. We may learn this lesson from the Odes of Horace themselves. The writer of iv. 8. 20 *sqq.* knew it well—'neque | si chartae *sileant* quod bene *feceris* | mercedem *tuleris*. quid foret Iliac | Mauortisque puer si taciturnitas | obstaret meritis inuida Romuli?' Secondly, they *can* refer to a future event if it be suggested that this event is unattainable. The Bore might thus suggest that Horace would find him a very useful person to introduce to Maecenas, but that he despairs of an introduction. But why he should damn his own hopes beforehand, it is not easy to see. Thirdly, to cut the matter short, the reference may be to a past that was not realised, which is not without relation to the present. The Bore may mean 'As it is, you have no second fiddle and so you *have not* ousted your rivals: but you might have done so if you had chosen to give me an introduction to your patron.' In this sense the words are appropriate and effective. They would suggest to Horace the loss which he has already suffered by making no use of his interlocutor hitherto.

Suppose this to be allowed, it would seem clearly best to take the previous sentence to apply to the poet. The passage will then mean 'You have used your opportunities well, my friend. But think, if you had had me!' This necessitates the insertion of *te* before *usus* as Boissonade proposed: for otherwise the statement would apply to Maecenas, the subject of the previous sentence. It has been objected to this insertion that *te* is emphatic and so cannot be elided. The objection is unreasonable since the chief emphasis falls on *nemo* and not on *te*, as any one who reads the words aloud may see. And it is gained by actual fact. A single citation is enough to confute it. In Silius 3. 119 *sqq.* 'quippe nec Ausonios tantum nec tela nec ignes | quantum te metuo: ruis ipsos acer in enses | obiectasque caput telis nec <*te*> ulla secundo | euentu satiat uirtus, tibi gloria soli | fine caret,' a similarly 'emphatic' *te* is similarly elided in the same part of the verse and similarly omitted by all the manuscripts but (and here the similarity ends) restored to the author

by the unanimous agreement of his editors.

The course of our argument has now brought us back to the last problem of the passage, the assignment of the words 'paucorum—sanae.' It is clear that the exclusive and canny man in the Bore's description must be Maecenas. The breathless and indecent haste with which he develops his theme before Horace can stop him is an admirable piece of character drawing.

It seems to me that a good many difficulties in the Satires of Horace are diminished if we bear in mind their highly allusive character. An expression which is half one author's and half another's is apt to be misjudged should we fail to recognise its composite character. It will even seem discordant and incoherent when the clue to the reference is gone. To take a very simple instance 'adeo sermonis amari | Sisennas, Barros ut *equis praecurreret albis*' I. vii. 8 the phrase, strange enough in itself as an equivalent of *longe praecurreret*, loses half its oddity if we put '*equis albis*' between mental marks of quotation.

This mode of explanation may be applied to I. i. 99 *sq.* 'at hunc liberta securi | diuisit medium, fortissima Tyndaridarum.' The incoherence here is great and has caused much trouble. It disappears, if we assume that Horace is quoting or, it may be, parodying the end of a line which was familiar to his readers.

Parodies of Furius Bibaculus are recognised at Sat. II. v. 39–41 (see Orelli-B.-M.) and at II. x. 36 *sqq.* 'turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque | defingit Rheni luteum caput.' But the points of the criticism in the last case have, so far as I know, been only imperfectly appreciated. Horace jeers at Furius for applying to men a verb which the chief of Latin epic poets only uses of cattle, for coining the strange word *defingit* ('*diffingit*' is devoid of meaning) and for misusing *luteus* in the sense of *lutulentus* ('ut fluere *lutulentus*' I. iv. 11), or *limosus*. *Luteus* can only mean 'made of mud' or 'plastered with mud' and hence Horace scoffs at the artist in language, who would describe the turbid source of a river but whose words really mean that he 'models its head in clay.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wickham, who rightly says there is a continuous metaphor, quotes Conington's translation 'gives his Rhine a head-piece of brown mud.' Conington's 'brown mud' reminds us that some commentators (the *alii* of Orelli-B.-M.) found *luteum* so puzzling that they must confound it with *luteum* and see in it an allusion to the yellow polls of the Germans, Pers. 6. 46.

At I. x. 57, *quaerere num illius num rerum dura negarit* | *uersiculos naturamagis factos et euntis* | *mollius' illius* has a quantity which occurs nowhere else in Horace who has *illius* eleven times. The prevalence of *illius* is too great to be accidental and must indicate a preference. If Horace had been indifferent to the quantity, we should have expected a ratio more like that in his

contemporary Tibullus who has *illius* four and *illius* two or perhaps three times. It is probable that the singular quantity is taken over from Lucilius, of whom he is speaking, and to whose own profession he makes direct reference just below, vv. 60-1, cf. iv. 9, 10.

J. P. POSTGATE.

### A SUPPLEMENT TO THE APPARATUS CRITICUS OF MARTIAL.

#### III. (continued from p. 46).

THE MS. recently bought in Lucca for the Königliche Bibliothek, Berlin (lat. fol. 612) quite eclipses in interest all the MSS. of Martial with which we have been concerned. It is a twelfth century member of the second family, the family descended from Torquatus Gennadius' recension of 401 A.D. The other members of this family are Renaissance MSS., liable to the doubt and suspicion under which a text of Martial penned by a Renaissance scribe must always fall. Here we have a MS. removed by some centuries from the Renaissance period, and may congratulate ourselves at last on the possession of a Gennadius text that is above suspicion.

A brief account of the leading characteristics of the new MS. (I call it *L*) will be found in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* of June 22. Here I will give its readings for all the passages in which *P*- or *Q*-readings have been cited in the two previous articles. A full collation I hope to be able to publish in a short time.

I. Epist. (in fol. i v. summo) 7 iocorum; 11 latina eloqui *m. 1*; i.-ii. (in fol. i. r. imo); iii. 2 uacent; v. 1 naumachias; viii. 2 saluus *ex* saluus *ut vid.*; x. 4 appetitur; xii. 10 parta; xiii. (*confl. cum xii.*) 4 tu quod; xiv. 2 hos; xx. 3 tanto uentri\*\* laeque (*corr. uentrique gulaeque*) (*om. tibi*); xxvii. 2 peractos; xxvii. 3. 7 procelle (*et in lemm. AD PROCELLUM*) 4 factam *ut vid.*, *corr. factam*; xxix. 4 hoc (*per compend.*); xxxiv. 5 testem; xxxvi. 5 si qui; xli. 4-xlvii. 1 *om.*; xlviii. 6 caueae; xlix. 11 breve, *corr. -vi*; 21 repetens; 41 uita; 42 Quem; li. 3 tauris; lii. 2 si tamen dicere; liii. 4 interposito—uncto; lv. 3 petet, 11 uillica *ex* uillica; lviii. 3 dolet hoc mea mentula mecum; lix. 1 baiana; lx. 5 dom. nem.; lxi. 1 \*amat, 3 aponi; lxiv. 3 dum; lxv. 1 ficus,

4 ficos *ex -us*; lxvi. 4 nummis sophos, 5 quaerere, 10 punicata; lxix. 1 maxima; lxx. 15 amat; lxxi. 2 lycis, 3 effuso; lxxvi. 10 semper inane, 13 adcircum pulpitata (*corr. -ita*); lxxviii. 7 scā romana, 8 rogo (*corr. rec. uita*); lxxx. 1 A seruo; lxxxvi. 7 iliacam, 12 ut inq.; lxxxviii. 3 Aspice—pondera saxo, 9 perne uerit; xc. 3 omnis et; xciii. 1 amicus, 6 raros; xevi. 1 Sinon est mol. te quod, 2 mamater\*o, *corr. materno*; ciii. 3 sqq. *post IV lxix.* 2; civ. 8 uisontes *corr. bis.*, 20 uenerit; cix. 8 nixa; cxi. 3 quid (*corr. qui*); cxiii. 1 quond. pu., 5\*\* polio; cxiv. 5 Et stugias (*corr. stig.*) sed (*per compend.*) dum fuerat; cxv. 1 inuidae; cxvi. 1 cinerem, *corr. rec. -um*, 15 altero ueniendo nomen; cxviii. 2 deciliane.

II. Epist. 1 parum enim tibi prestamus, 3 uerbis dicere, 5 sua id est mala; i. 5 peragit; iv. 7 matremque (*man. 1*); v. 3 distinguunt; vi. 2 *post v. 3*, 3 spectasses cato collium; vii. 1 attale (*in lemm. AD ATTALVM*), 5 attice, 7 facis tamen, 8 quid sis hardalio *ex* ard.; xi. 2 sera, 4 tang. ind., 10 quae est; xii. 2 Quodque tibi est numquam; xiv. 6 pyllirides, 13 thermis iterumque iterumque iterumque; 15 europes tepida, 17 uector; xv. 2 hormone (*et in lemm. AD HORMVM*); xvi. 4 quis nisi, 5 demitte; xvii habet *L*; xxiii. 2 Qui, 3 enim mihi ne; xxvi. 2 tuos *m. 1*, suos *m. 2*; xxix. 1 terentem; 3 quotiens *m. 1*, 10 quid; xxx. 3 fidusque; xxxi. 1 christinam; xxxii. 3 protas, 5 letoria; xxxiv. 6 pontica; xxxvi. 3 \*\*\*\* arum; xxxvii. 1 uer\*\*\*, 6 halica; xxxix habet *L*; xl. 3 nunc, 5 siccentur annus coxit; xli. 10 manumue; xlv. 2 tres, 6 sed (*per compend.*) ut, 11 cum rogaris; xlviii. 3 et paucos sed (*per compend.*) ut; xlix. cum xlviii *confl.*; li. 3 non auferet; lii habet *L*; liii. 2 potes; liv. 5 malignusque (*ex-nusque*) est; lv. 3 sexte colo; lvi. 1 malaudit; lvi.

2 fedae; lxi. 1 tenera, 3 fastigia; lxii. 4 quod; lxiii. 3 amaris; lxiv. 2 taure, 8 potest; lxvi. 4 phlegusa, 6 Et sanum tangat, 8 tua; lxvii. 4 decam *m. 1*; lxviii. 9 habet *L*; lxx. 2 coyle quae *om.*; lxxi. 5 illud; lxxii. 4 Vilia; lxxiii hab. *L*; lxxiv. 7 Fuficulenus; lxxvi. 2 dedit; lxxix. 1 uocasse; lxxxii. 1 Abscisa serum quod fugis *p. lingua*; lxxxiii *confl. cum lxxxii*, 3 truncis; lxxxv. 1 copte; lxxxvi. 10 inertiarum; xc. 5 uincere; xcii *confl. cum xci*.

III. ii. 4 madidas, 11 cocco; iii. *om.*; v. 1 cursus, 10 habere libet; vii. 2 conglarium; viii. 1 amat quam thaida luscum; xi. 3 dixi, 6 amet *ex amat ut vid.*; xiii. 1 Dum non uis piscem dum non uis carpere pullos; xv. 1 credit; xvi. 5 corio] satis est; xvii. 3 sabidi; xix. 2 pictae plata nona; xx. 5 locus, 7 sopheleis, 9 tinctus atticos, 10 hinc si ressis teri, 12 rufus, 14 ambulat ue; xxi. 1 notatus; xxii. 1 apici; xxiii *confl. cum xxii*, 1 retro pueris; xxiv. 2 grata sacris, 8 manus, 10 hanc; xxv. 4 Neronianas is refr.; xxvi. 5 puto (*o ex corr.*); xxix hab. *L*; xxxi. 4 mensa; xxxii. 1 quaerere matria, 3 niobe (*ut vid.*) matria *m. 1*; xxxv habet *L*; xxxviii. 3 cicerone dissertius ipso *m. 1*, 4 par mihi nemo foro, 6 Norasse neutri; xlv. 3 circa, 4 quod sit scire; xlv. 1 mensas ph., 3 iste, 5 rhombos; xlv. 6 ingenuumque, 7 in causam narraberis, 11 -abis; xlvii. 4 plus illi, 6 ruris trahent, 8 porrum, 10 coram; 1. 4 oxygarumque; liv. 1 possis, 2 multos *m. 1*; lv. 2 effusos, 3 cellia; lviii. 18 columbarum *ex* -narum, 24 carbo, 26 subdole, 29 hortus, 37 hinc uag. *m. hispidae fetum*, 42 auara seruatur, 48 poscentis, 51 uocari debet; lx. 5 su—illos *m. 1*, sumo pusillos *m. rec. in ras.*; lxii. 3 deci, 7 credis magno; lxiii. 5 qui et gaud.; lxv. 1 malum tenera, 3 cum floret, 7 imbrem (*m. 1*); lxvi. 1 fartus; lxviii. 5 hinc; lxix. 5 nequam iuuenes; lxxi. 2 sed (*per compend.*); lxxii. 3 pendent a pectore, 6 cynici, 8 uitium peius habes; lxxiii. 1 mutuniat, 2 phaebe, 4 credere te, 2. 6 *transp.*; lxxvi. 3 est haec, 4 ecaben; lxxxii. 2 sum memmia nascent inter, 5 gaiginatus, 9 cuspidemque lentisce, 13 corpus, 15 hab. *L*, 16 seiscitator, 20 agri, 25 mythinisque, 26 fuscis; lxxxvi. 4 mimis; lxxxvii. 1 te rumor chione; xci. 9 exciduntque, 11 fama est quondam; xciii. 2 sint *om.*, 10 noctua uidet (*det per compend., fort. dent.*), 15 admittit, 19 uirumque, 20 si satiae, 21 uocauit, 24 acoridet tr., 26 ustorquae taedes; xcv. 1 sed rides, 9 Esset; xcix. 3 Innocuos ludere, 4 non liceat licuit; c. 4 ille.

IV. i. 4 nite, 9 sed (*per compend.*); iii. 2 cesaris inque, 3 muto, 6 dis simulacre; iv. 1 palus, 12 quam quod; v. 1 bonus uerus,

7 circa, 9–10 hab. *L*; viii. 11 grassum met ire, 12 matutinos nostra thalia; ix. AD BYLLAM, 1 clunici bulla, 3 *exi sauros*; xiii. 1 nupsit pudenti, 9 sedet ipsa maritum; xiv. 4 Astus, 14 marino; xix. 13 sidone; xx *post xiv*; xxi. 3 haec; xxii. 7 insuluis; xxiii. 6 cecropio, 7 Romanae sale; xxv. 6 hausit, 7 requies portusque; xxvi. 3 uicinos ter puto; xxvii. 2 negat, 3 honerato non; xxviii. 3 et totam lepido totam; xxix. 2 opes, 3 pudent; xxx. 6 quid quod., 9 tremente; xxxi. 10 hippodamus; xxxii. 3 malorum; xxxiv. 1 dicit, 2 dicit; xxxvii. 3 sabellus, 5 ter ducenta; xxxviii. 1 satiatur nisi; xxxix hab. *L*; xl. 7 honorem, 9 serum talium; xlii. 1 roganti, 2 locare, 4 nequitiam, 6 esse solet, 9 breuiter sit, 15 fallis, 16 dicens; xliii. 11 cunnilingi svx; xlv. 5 arbor; xlv. 7 tressae librae, 9 lacuna, 14 ceno; xlvii. 1 eneastus; xlix. 1 nescis, 2 putas; 1. 1 thais, 2 thais; li. 2 late, 3 decies tribuit; liii. 6 dat latratos; liv. 3 utaris, 5 nullis, 10 neget *m. 1 ut vid.*, -at *m. 2 ut vid.*; lv. 1 duorum, 18 peterē, 19 ripas, 20 suaebos, 21 turgentisque 1. tura si aequae, 22 paruo toutonissae, 23 pura teones (*corr. -nis*), 24 quos; lvii. 2 pumiceis latent; lix. 2 gemma, 4 uincta; lx. 3 cur latius; lxi. 3 inschola, 12 meridie, 13 male, 14 tam, 16 audire *om.*; lxiii. 1 aboculis, 3 neroni; lxiv. 2 heseridum, 4 eminent, 10 uittae, 14 facit, 19 patet, 28 comparet, 31 quae, 32 contento, 33 pendulum; 34 deditis aediam; lxvi. 8 rubens, 12 turba, 14 fluit; lxvii. 5 thalioque; lxviii *confl. cum lxvii*; lxix. 1 marsica; lxx. 1 mamiano, 4 mammianus; lxxi. 5 caste sunt; lxxiii. 4 nulla, 6 te tricas, 7 tam; lxxiv. hab. *L*; lxxv. 5 inlecta; lxxviii. 5 prodire, 8 sigerosque; lxxx. *confl. cum lxxix*, 4 sudares, 5 est eras (*corr. erras*), 6 exurit; lxxxi. 3 bisque terque; lxxxii. hab. *L*; lxxxiv. 2 thaidam; lxxxvi. 3 docte; lxxxvii. 2 facit, 3 est; lxxxix. 4 scida, *corr. rec. ut vid. sceda*, 7 defecitque.

V. ii. 6 iocetur; vi. hab. *L*; viii. 3 recipit, 5 rubens, 11 illa; x. 3 insunt; xiv. 3 terque transtulit castra, 11 sededere letoque; xv. 3 honoratus nomine, 6 prosunt; xvi. 6 sollicitis uelim, 12 nimium, 13 inquit dixi satis est; xvii. 4 cistifero; xviii. 8 uoratum, 9 nihil diuiti; xix. 1 uestris (ūris), 3 saecula (*per compend.*) nulla, 11 *sq. nov. epigr.* AD CESAREM, 13 regis, 17 *sq. nov. epigr.* AD GERMANICVM; xx. 7 imagines superbas; xxii. 7 murorum, 10 lassa; xxiv. 3 Herm. glad. (*et om.*), 8 sibi ipsi, 15 et ter; xxv. 2 letus 3 equis; xxvi. 4 betame; xxviii. 4 drusones; xxx. 2 suscipiente de (*eras.*); xxxi. 7 gestus sed de discrimine palmae; xxxiv. 3 pallida; xxxv. 5 et suscitant si ei tore

luctatur, 6 equitis urbo; xxxvii. 1 cignis, 4 praeferens, 5 indicae ntem (*corr. dentem*), 9 rosarium; xxxviii. 3 syca merize; xli. 1 fluxo, 3 sectus, 5 fabulasque; xlv. 2 quae; xlv. 3 credo, 4 consequar hoc me; xlviii. 7 ne crede; xlix. 3 numeros, 5 uel possunt, 9 tum; liii. 4 aut; lv. 1 portas; lvi. 4 diuites; lx. 4 a meis, 8 erunt; lxi. 7 inquit; lxii. lxiv. *hab. L*; lxv. 2 nemees, 4 sicula tusus, 8 maiora, 9 maiora, 11 si *om.*, 13 quidem; lxvii. 2 athidis, 6 cum; lxxi. 1 quae, 5 fauste, *corr. faustine*; lxxvi. 1 toto, 2 possent (*e ex i*); lxxviii. 3. propin, 7 nigraculi cuius, 8 qui modo, 13 perunt, 29 quo nec, 30 condili; lxxix. 1 surrexit (*per compend.*), 3 ni; lxxx. 1 uacabis, 6 ista; lxxxi. 2 nulli *om. (supra add. man. rec. nullis)*; lxxxiv. 3 fritillos, 11 marcias, 12 Tunc.

VI. ii. 1 tede, 4 quos; iii. 6 tota; v. 1 multis sum praedia (*per compend.*) nummis; vii. 4 nubit, thelesina; viii. 6 digno nequid; x. 12 sunt; xii. 2 peierat; xiii. 1 formauit, 5 nudo, 7 mortis; xv. 3 contenta; xvi. 1 tu qui, 3 uenit; xvii. 1 cinnam cinname *m. I*; xix. 1 non diui; xxi. *hab. L*; xxiii. 1 semper nostrum, 4 contra te; xxv. 8 ducis; xxvii. 8 anus; xxviii. 5 flamminea; xxix. *post xxx.* 4 glaucia, 8 ames; xxx. 4 rogatus; xxxii. 4 nuda; xxxiii. 4 tam; xxxv. 3 dicis *ex ducis*; xxxvi. 1 quantus; xxxvii.

2-3 *hab. L*; xxxix. 3 filius qui, 20 iam niobidarum, 21 choresus; xl. 3 quod tu non; xlii. 8 micat, 18 marciaue; xliii. 6 uestrae mihi sunt, 9 urbis; xlv. 3 in o.; xlv. 4 turpius; xlvii. 8 satis; xlix. 10 nascitur; l. 1 pueros, 3 obscenos cepit; li. 4 inquis; lv. 4 coricine; lviii. 1 dum, 6 pudor, 10 clarus; lx. 2 spargit, 10 uicturum; lxii. 2 munera mittere appiane; lxiv. 20 timendus, 24 si quis, 28 uiui nasum, 32 tacitam; lxvi. 6 manum; lxix. 2 potat; lxx. 12 priamique; lxxi. 3 pelie; lxxiii. 3 ditissimus; lxxiv. 1 imus, 2 similem, 3 fuditque; lxxv. 1 turdumue; lxxvii. 5 aper, 6 si spaciare; lxxviii. 1 potator; lxxxi. 2-3 *hab. L*; lxxxii. 6 aurem habebat auam, 12 michi ruffe; lxxxiii. 5 summo tonanti, 7 etruscos; lxxxv. 1 editus ē (*mihi om.*) rufe (*e in ras.*) amoni, 8 quanta; lxxxvi. 6 et potet calidam qui michi libet aquam; lxxxviii. 2 sosibiane; lxxxix. 1 peteret nocte matellam (*ex capellam*); xci. 2 futuis *m. I*; xcii. 2 pateram pronos; xciii. 9 late *ex lata ut vid.*, 11 totam mille putabit.

Corrections by a recent hand are often ignored in the above list. The following additions have to be made to the two previous articles:

I. xlix. 5 catum *E*; V. xiv. 11 leito *E*; xvi. 13 laudabimus *E*.

W M. LINDSAY.

#### THE QUANTITY OF VOWELS BEFORE *GN*.

THE practice of marking all vowels long before *gn* is so completely established in our American text-books, that any departure from this would seem almost revolutionary to the great majority of Latin teachers, who, very properly devoting their time to more important subjects, must perforce in matters of hidden quantity depend upon the 'authorities,' that is the more recent school-grammars and lexicons, or, at most, such manuals as Marx's *Hülfsbüchlein* or Bennett's Appendix,—the latter of which, be it incidentally remarked, shows a marked advance over the former. Yet the unanimity of our text-books in this matter does not reflect a corresponding unanimity in the opinions of scholars at large or in the character of the evidence.

For although, after the early discussions of this point by J. Schmidt and Corssen, probably the majority of scholars, with Marx, adopted the view of J. Schmidt, that

vowels before *gn* were always long, protests have appeared with increasing frequency. Fröhde, *Bezz. Beitr.* 16, 190, concludes that the lengthened vowel was thoroughly established only in certain words ('Entschieden durchgedrungen scheint hiernach die Dehnung des Vocals vor *gn* nur in einigen Wörtern zu sein.') Havet, *Mem. Soc. Ling.* 6, 34 scoffs at those who take seriously the oft-quoted statement in Priscian on this point, which he regards as an interpolation. Sittl, *Bursian's Jahresbericht*, 68, 251, remarks 'Aber hier kann man auf Grund anderer Stellen (Seelmann 91) mit Bestimmtheit sagen, dass die Verantwortung für diese falsche Regel Priscian allein zufällt.' Cocchia, *Rassegna Critica* (known to the writer through the quotations in Karsten, *Uitspraak van het Latijn*), argues at length that the statement in Priscian is an interpolation and worthless as a generalization.

Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* 138, after reviewing



the evidence, concludes 'that if the lengthening of a vowel before *gn* was a tendency of Latin pronunciation at all, it was not one so marked, and so persistent, as the lengthening before us.' And in the list of hidden quantities given in his Short Hist. Lat. Gram. he recognizes the lengthening only in 'dignus' and 'signum' (in *rēgnum*, *stāgnum* and *sēgnis* the vowel is long by origin) and even in these two with the reservation 'probably.' Bennett, although in the Grammar he follows the usual practice, remarks in the Appendix that 'there is no evidence to support such a principle' (that is that all vowels are long before *gn*), and advocates a system of eclecticism.<sup>1</sup>

Stolz, Hist. Gram. p. 230, is uncertain as to the universality of the lengthening before *gn*, but follows the usual practice of marking it long; he continues the same practice in the third edition of his Lat. Gram. in the Iw. Müller Handbuch, although in this briefer work he does not discuss the evidence anew and contents himself with an 'according to Priscian.' Brugmann has previously assumed lengthening before *gn* without reserve, but in the second edition of the first volume of the Grundriss he remarks (p. 806) that this lengthening seems to have belonged only to certain strata of society ('nur gewissen Verkehrskreisen.') Accordingly he recognizes the existence of both *signum* and *signum, dignus* and *dignus*, etc. (e.g. pp. 121, 677, 680), although in general, in the citation of words with *gn*, where the history of the vowel is not under discussion, he retains the usual practice of marking it long. Among those who no longer accept the view that vowels are always long before *gn* we may safely include Osthoff, although he does not anywhere discuss the matter. For in his recent etymological article he cites words with *gn* without marking the vowel long, e.g. *lignum, tignum, magnus* (Idg. F.

<sup>1</sup> Yet this principle is not followed out by Bennett quite consistently. If he gives so much weight to Priscian's statement as to assume vowel-length in *magnus, pugna* and many others for which there is no specific evidence, he should not hesitate to do the same for *agnus*. For the compound *ambiegnus*, although cited by others also (e.g. Havet l.c.) as evidence against the long vowel, really has no bearing on the question. To be sure it shows that the vowel of *agnus* was not long when the weakening took place. But it is well known that the weakening process antedated the vowel-lengthening before *ns* (cf. the relation of *thanetō*, whence *hālō*, to *tanhenetō*, whence *anhelō*), and, similarly, the vowel-lengthening before *gn*, if such there were, would not have been early enough to interfere with the weakening process.

8, 30, 34) *signum* (Bezz. Beitr. 24, 180); and in the case of a scholar who has given so much attention to hidden quantity and is so careful in the marking of vowel-length, this, of course, is not accidental.

It is sufficiently clear, without further citation of opinions, that vowel-lengthening before *gn* is far from being a universally accepted fact. Let us turn to the evidence itself, which, briefly stated, is as follows.

In support of the lengthening are adduced: (1) the well-known statement in Priscian (Keil. II, p. 82) "*Gnus*" quoque vel "*gna*" vel "*gnum*" terminantia longam habent vocalem paenultimam, ut "*rēgnum*," "*stāgnum*," "*benignus*," "*malignus*," "*abiēgnus*," "*privignus*," "*Pelignus*"; (2) the fact that in a few words we actually find the vowel before *gn* written with the apex or as *I longa*.<sup>2</sup>

In support of the short vowel before *gn* stand: (1) the fact that, except in words with an original long vowel, the Romance languages point to a short vowel before *gn*<sup>3</sup>; (2) the fact that the Celtic and Germanic words borrowed from Latin *signum* also point to a short vowel; (3) the total absence on inscriptions of the apex or *I longa* in the case of the great majority of words with *gn*, some of them, like *magnus*, of so frequent occurrence that this absence can hardly be accidental<sup>4</sup>; (4) the citation

<sup>2</sup> An additional point made by Marx, to the effect that in words like *agnōscō*, *cognōscō* the vowel of the preposition must be long because of the loss of the final *d* or *n*, would not be urged by any one to-day. This is not the kind of consonant-loss which is accompanied by vowel-lengthening.

<sup>3</sup> W. Meyer's interpretation of the Romance evidence (K. Z. 30, 337), which enables him to square it with the supposed lengthening in Latin, and which would apply equally to the evidence of Germanic and Celtic borrowed words, is one which, while theoretically possible, is nevertheless distinctly improbable. It is true of course that Romance shows us the quality, and only indirectly the quantity, of Latin vowels, and that there are sometimes special factors which vitiate the usual reasoning from quality to quantity. A lengthened vowel might have the quality of the short vowel from which it came rather than that of the original long vowel, as in fact was the case in most Greek dialects and in Oscan (e.g. *ligud* for *\*legōd*, with *i* for original *ē*, but *keenzetur* with *ee* for the *e* lengthened before *ns*). But as a matter of fact this was not the case in Latin, judging, as we are entitled to do, from the history of the lengthened vowel before *ns*, which gives the same result in Romance as an original long vowel.

<sup>4</sup> As there is no uniformity in the marking of long vowels on inscriptions, the *argumentum ex silentio* is a dangerous one, and should never be given weight against positive and unconflicting evidence of length. But if the quantity of the vowel is in doubt, one's scepticism of its length is naturally increased by the absence of inscriptional evidence of length, in the case of words of very frequent occurrence.



of *dignitās* as an anapaest by the grammarian Diomedes (Keil I, p. 470), who, in discussing the rhythmical arrangement appropriate to the end of a period, as shown by the practice of Cicero and others, has in mind, curiously enough, only vowel-quantity not syllabic quantity, as is shown clearly by his citations (e.g. *esse pro nobis* cited, l. c. p. 469, as a spondee preceded by an anapaest).<sup>1</sup>

The passage in Priscian, which plays the leading rôle in the discussion, is as, already noted, regarded as an interpolation by Havet, l. c., and by Cocchia, l. c. It is certainly clear, as pointed out in detail by Cocchia, that the passage stands in no proper connection with the immediate context, which deals with the formation of adjectives from proper names, and that it is most plausibly explained as a note made by a later grammarian to the statement, some lines back, "*Anagnia*" quoue quia g ante n habet "*Anagninus*." This last asserts nothing as to the vowel-quantity before *gn*, and means simply that, while from most names in *ia* the adjectives end in *-nus*, as *Hispanus* from *Hispania*, the adjective of *Anagnia*, owing to the *g* before the *n*, had *-inus* like *Lucerinus* from *Luceria*, etc.

But whether the passage in question was written by Priscian in the sixth century, or by some one else a century or two later, is, after all, not a vital question. Priscian himself, as is well known, sometimes mistakes syllabic length for vowel-length, and the statement made, whether by him or another, cannot, by itself, command much confidence. On the other hand, it will have some weight if supported by other evidence. Of the words specifically mentioned, three, *regnum*, *stagnum*, and *abiagnus*, may be accepted without question as having an

And even a single example of an apex or *I* longa may not be conclusive. Our text-books generally follow Marx in writing *māximus*. But taking into account the fact that vowel-lengthening before *x* is not to be admitted and that original length in this word is, to say the least, extremely improbable, we ought to attach less importance to the single example of an apex on an inscription which is not free from mistakes (e.g. *immolavit*) than to the fact that there is no other example, although the word occurs hundreds and hundreds of times on imperial monuments, plenty of these showing the apex in other words.

<sup>1</sup> As further evidence for the short vowel have often been adduced: (1) the Greek transcription of *cognitū* as *κογνιτου*,—but this has little weight, as *o* is not uncommon as a transcription of Lat. *ō*; (2) the existence of *ambiegnus* beside *agnus*,—but this is wholly irrelevant (see above); (3) the occasional shortening in Plautus and Terence of the first syllable of *ignāve*, *ignobilis*, etc., after short syllables, —but the usual assumption that initial syllables in which the vowel itself is long are never shortened is contested by Skutsch, *Satura Viadrina*.

originally long vowel. In the others, *benignus*, etc., the vowel was, almost certainly, originally short, so that the length would have to be attributed to secondary lengthening before *gn*. Turning to the inscriptional evidence, we find that four out of the six words with the vowel marked long are also such as have, according to their recognized etymologies, an originally short vowel namely *signum* (*signum* CIL. vi. 10234; *signa* Boissieu, *Inscr. de Lyon* p. 606; *seignum* xiv 4270; *significabo* vi 16664), *dignus* (*dlgne* vi 6314; *digni* x 5676), *privignus* (*privigno* vi 3541), *ignis* (*Ignis* xi 826). From this it is evident that there actually existed in some words a pronunciation with lengthened vowel, and we ought not to maintain, as some do, that the statement in Priscian is made out of whole cloth.

On the other hand, the evidence for the short vowel, which has been briefly summarized above, makes it equally clear that even in these same words there also existed a pronunciation with the short vowel, while for most words there is no specific evidence for any other pronunciation than that with the short vowel. How are these facts to be reconciled? The true explanation is suggested by the history of vowel-lengthening before *r* + consonant.

In certain words like *ōrdō*, *fōrma*, etc., the evidence for a long vowel is so strong (incomparably stronger than in any of the words with *gn* cited above) that every one admits the length; and it is pretty generally recognized that in these the length is not original, but the result of lengthening before *r* + consonant. Yet no one maintains, on the basis of this fact, that the same is true of all words in which a vowel is followed by *r* + consonant, or even of all words for which there is an occasional example of an apex or *I* longa (e.g. *vīrtus*, *vīrgo*). The explanation of the apparent anomaly is as follows: (cf. also Seelmann, *Aussprache*, 91; Bennett, *Appendix* 63; Solmsen, *K. Z.* 34, 23; Osthoff, *Bezz. Beitr.* 24, 133). In certain localities or strata of society there existed a tendency to lengthen vowels when followed by *r* + consonant. But such a pronunciation remained for the most part a vulgarism, censured by the grammarians.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Marius Plotius (Keil vi. 451, 5) mentions as a barbarism the pronunciation *pērnix*, and Pompeius (Keil v. 126, 5) refers to the mispronunciation of *arma* with long *a*. Yet Diomedes must have had this vulgar pronunciation *ārma* in mind in the passage (Keil i. 469) where he speaks of it as a trochee. For, as noted above, he is observing vowel-quantity, not syllabic quantity.

Only in certain words it gained a wider currency and eventually became thoroughly established as the recognized pronunciation.<sup>1</sup>

Similar, we believe, was the history of vowel-lengthening before *gn*,—up to a certain point. It existed as a locally or socially restricted pronunciation. In some words, judging from the inscriptional evidence, it gained more currency than in others. But, in contrast to the history of vowel-lengthening before *r*+consonant, not even for these words does the evidence as a whole warrant the assumption that this became the recognized pronunciation. Forms like *signum*, *dignus* are not on the same footing as *fôrma*, *ôrdô*, etc., but rather on a par with *fîrmus*, *vîrtûs*, *Hêrculês*, etc.

Our conclusion, then, is that for the cultivated language, which is what we aim to represent in our pronunciation and spelling a long vowel before *gn* is to be recognized only where it is long in origin, as, for example, in *rêgnum*.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,  
February, 1901.

<sup>1</sup> The attempt to draw the line exactly between words in which the pronunciation with a long vowel became established and those in which it did not, is bound to be somewhat arbitrary. Yet we can make what is probably a close approximation to the truth. The long vowel is rightfully recognized by all scholars in the case of *fôrma*, *ôrdô*, *ôrnô* and their

derivatives, where the inscriptional evidence is unusually strong and is also confirmed by the Romance. The long vowel is almost equally certain in the case of *Mârs*, *Mârcus*, *Lârs* (in these proper names it may be originally long; the question need not concern us here) and in *quârtus*, although some scholars write, e.g., *Marcus*, *quartus*. For in these the inscriptional evidence is every whit as strong as for *ôrdô*, etc., and the only conceivable justification for making a distinction would be that in *quartus*, etc., the long vowel is not confirmed by the Romance. But, as always in the case of *a*-vowels, the Romance cannot either confirm or refute the length. With *fîrmus*, which appears in most of our text-books as *fîrmus*, we cross the line, at least in the judgment of the writer, to the words in which the long vowel, though known, had not become established as the usual pronunciation. Five examples of the *l* longa are quoted by Christiansen (*De apicibus*, etc.), while the Romance forms point clearly to the short vowel. If any one should take the position that, while the popular speech, as reflected in the Romance, had the short vowel, the language of the cultivated classes, the High Latin, knew only the long vowel in this word, we could only maintain the extreme improbability of this view on general grounds. This vowel lengthening before *r*+consonant we do not regard as a characteristic of the cultivated speech which worked its way downward into the popular speech, but rather as a characteristic of some particular phase of popular speech, which in some words spread throughout the popular speech and lastly to the cultivated language. We regard *fîrmus*, then, as a vulgarism which was not uncommon, as shown by the number of examples with the apex, but which did not become the usual form in the popular speech, much less in the cultivated speech. Among the numerous other words in which the vowel is occasionally marked long on inscriptions, as *Hêrculês*, *fôrtuna*, *vîrtus*, etc., there is none in which it is at all likely that this pronunciation was generally adopted.

#### ON THE SO-CALLED 'INDECLINABLE OR ABSOLUTE USE' OF IPSE, AND ALLIED CONSTRUCTIONS.

IN the Latin Grammar of Gildersleeve and Lodge § 311. 2, Note, the following words occur: "Livy seems to use sometimes ipse in connexion with a reflexive as if it were indeclinable or absolute: cum dies venit, causa ipse pro se dicta damnatur, L. iv. 44, 10."

The statement requires examination. In the first place this 'absolute' use of ipse does not necessarily occur 'in connexion with a reflexive' e.g. Livy 29. 2. 2. Romani quoque imperatores...iunctis et ipsi exercitibus per agrum Ansetanum...pervenire; also 45. 10. 2. dimissis et ipse Atticis navibus...navigare Aegyptum pergit. Weissenborn quotes further Tac. Germ. 37. Quid enim aliud nobis quam caedem Crassi amisso et ipse Pacoro infra Ventidium deictus Oriens obiecerit? Indeed Livy iv.

44. 10. happens to be the only instance cited of ipse supported by a reflexive in this 'absolute' construction.

Secondly, one may ask why the terms 'indeclinable or absolute' should be used at all? When I write 'ipse pro se locutus damnatur' is ipse 'indeclinable or absolute'? In Gildersleeve's citation ipse though logically subject of 'causa dicta' is grammatically nominative to 'damnatur,' and no outrage is done to Latin syntax. Madvig (*Kleine Philol. Schr.* p. 367) has fully dealt with the question as far as concerns ipse, quisque, and plerique, but what I would like to emphasize is (1) that the construction even with these three words is not 'a peculiarity of Livy's style,' that Sallust and Caesar employed it before him, that the 'peculiarity of Livy's style' is his use of

the gerund in the ablative as an indeclinable present participle, not the addition of *ipse*, *quisque*, and other words which are then employed neither in an 'absolute' nor 'indeclinable' way; and (2) that a case like '*causa ipse pro se dicta*' is only a special instance of a general attempt to treat the ablative absolute as if it were an aorist participle in the nominative or accusative case.

Weissenborn has shown how frequent this is in Livy and how it occurs in Sallust. I desire further to demonstrate the frequency of this attempt in Caesar and Nepos, and to illustrate the various forms of it which are to be found both in these authors and in Livy.

It may be 'worth' while to give the references which I have collected from my own observation and from Weissenborn (*a*) of *ipse* and participle (already cited) Livy 4. 44. 10., 29. 2. 2., 45. 10. 2., and Tac. Germ. 37. (b) of *ipse* and ablative of gerund Livy 24. 4. 9., 25. 23. 11., 26. 39. 5., 27. 27. 6., 39. 49. 3., 40. 23. 1., 41. 24. 2., 45. 35. 8. (c) of *quisque* and participle Livy 21. 45. 9., and 32. 24. 4., but also Sallust Jug. 18. 3. *exercitus eius... amisso duce ac passim multis sibi quisque imperium petentibus, brevi dilabitur*, (d) of *quisque* and ablative of gerund Livy 2. 38. 6., 4. 31. 2., and 4. 43. 11. (e) of other subjects than *quisque* with ablative of gerund. Livy 9. 29. 2. *pertinaciam gerendo solus censuram obtinuit*, 22. 34. 10., 24. 5. 8., and 38. 17. 8. (42. 53. 3. though sometimes quoted is not much to the point) (f) of *plerique* with participle Livy 33. 9. 11.—an instance which, I find, is anticipated in Caesar Bell. Civ. 3. 95. *Nam, qui acie refugerant milites, ... missis plerique armis (= τὰ ὅπλα ῥίψαντες οἱ πολλοί)... magis de reliqua fuga... cogitabant*, and which is a case of Greek 'partial apposition,' (cf. Livy 21. 14. 1. *repente primores... argentum aurumque... in ignem ad id raptim factum concientes, eodem plerique semet ipsi praecipitaverunt*) only a less bold Graecism than Bell. Gall. 1. 53. *Daue filiae harum, altera occisa, altera capta est*.

Weissenborn has shown (2) that constructions like '*causa ipse pro se dicta*,' are by no means confined to *ipse*, e.g., Livy 1. 7. 11. *dextra Hercules data accipere se omen... ait*, and his instances may be, I think, conveniently divided under two heads (*a*) 'simple' i.e., where the subject lies between noun and participle as in the case just quoted, or (*b*) 'compound' i.e., where the subject lies between two ablative absolutes, e.g.,

1. 52. 1. *Revocatis deinde ad concilium Latinis Tarquinius collaudatisque, qui Turnum... poena adfecissent, ita verba facit*. Under (*a*) he quotes 21. 31. 9. *Sedatis Hannibal certaminibus... 21. 48. 5. missisque Hannibal primum Numidis... 22. 17. 7. agmine Hannibal traducto... 24. 25. 3. clausis Adranodorus Insulae portis... 41. 10. 13. contione adveniens de Manilio et Junio habita... 44. 31. 15. vix gladiatorio accepto decem talentis, ab rege rex... (where however *ab rege rex* is not 'hineingezeugen').*

He might have instanced 1. 39. 2. *ferunt... sedatoque eam tumultu moveri vetuisse puerum...*—a peculiarly appropriate order: for of the 'reges' mentioned a few lines earlier Tanquil (*eam*) was decidedly the better half, and, doubtless, Livy desires to emphasize the fact that it was she who quelled the tumult and not the king. Again he might have pointed out how 1. 4. 6. '*tenet fama... eam (sc. lupam) summissas infantibus adeo mitem prae buisse mammas*' is similar. The order of 'summissas,' with 'mitem' between it and 'mammas,' shows clearly that Livy read it αὐτὴν καθείσαν... παρασχέν.

Under (*b*) he cites 4. 49. 7. *Bolis insequente anno receptis Aequi coloniaque eo deducta... oppidum firmaverunt*, and 42. 55. 5. *sacrificio rite perfecto consul et frumento dato militibus paucos... moratus dies... militem ad Larisam ducit*—an interesting case because the ablative absolute is followed by a deponent (as in 21. 34. 4., 25. 35. 2., 45. 7. 5., 45. 26. 11., and elsewhere *passim*). He might also have instanced 1. 10. 5. *inde exercitu victore reducto ipse... spolia ducis hostium caesi suspensa fabricato ad id apte ferculo gerens in Capitolium escendit*, and 23. 28. 4. *omnibus omnis rebus ambo duces junctis copiis obviam ire... parant*.

Livy cannot be counted the inventor of either device. Of (*a*) Weissenborn himself provides an instance from Sallust Cat. 18. 5. *Cum hoc Catilina et Autronius... consilio communicato parabant... consules interficere*, and in Caesar and Nepos I have noted the following: Bell. Gall. 1. 44. *simulata Caesarem amicitia... (i), 2. 11. Hac re statim Caesar per speculatores cognita, insidias veritus... 5. 49. Quibus litteris circiter media nocte Caesar allatis (= acceptis) ... 6. 9. cognita Caesar causa... 6. 17. neglecta quispiam religione... 7. 1. Indictis inter se principes Galliae conciliis... Bell. Civ. 3. 12. Recepto Caesar Orico... 3. 62. quibus ille cognitis... Nepos. Paus. 5. 1. *His rebus ephori cognitis*,*

Dion 2. 5. hoc aeger sumpto..., Hann. 7. 4. Hoc responso Carthaginienses cognito..., and perhaps Datam. 4. 5. hunc Datames vinctum..., Datam. 5. 5. Talibus ille litteris cognitis..., and Paus. 2. 6. Huius Pausanias voluntate cognita... (In these examples from Caesar and Nepos the frequent occurrence of cognitus is noticeable.)

Of (f) I find five cases—Bell. Gall. 7. 34. Qua re cognita Vercingetorix omnibus interruptis eius fluminis pontibus ab altera Elaveris parte iter facere coepit., 7. 77. Depopulata Gallia Cimbri magnaue illata calamitate finibus nostris aliquando excesserunt., Bell. Civ. 3. 103. Quibus cognitis rebus Pompeius deposito adeundae Syriae consilio... Pelusium pervenit., Nepos. Hann. 10. 1. Sic conservatis suis rebus Poenus illis Cretensibus omnibus ad Prusiam in Pontum pervenit., and, perhaps, Them. 4. 5. Hac re audita barbarus nihil doli subesse credens... confligit.

In all the instances quoted (with the exception of Livy 44. 31. 15., and those in which ipse and quisque are combined with an ablative gerund) the position of the subject eases the construction, which was, no doubt, assisted by three principles:—(1) the desire of Latin to tell the elements of its story at once by bringing forward subject and object. Examples occur without number in the classical period e.g. Cic. De Off. 3. 22. 86. *Hunc Fabricius reduendum curavit...*, Tusc. 5. 39. 115. *Polyphemum Homerus cum ariete colloquantem fecit*, etc. etc.: (2) the wish to give emphasis to particular words e.g. Nepos. Dion. 6. 2. *accepit gravissimum parens vulnus morte filii...*, Livy 1. 20. 2. *insignique eum veste... adornavit*, etc. etc.: (3) the anxiety, perhaps, to avoid the collocation of words with similar terminations e.g. Nepos. Paus. 4. 2. *has ille litteras ephoris tradidit*, Livy 22. 23. 10. *cum tertia ipse expedita in statione erat*, etc. etc.

But cases like 21. 21. 1. carry the construction with which we have been dealing one step further. Livy there writes 'Hannibal... in hiberna concesserat ibique auditis, quae Romae... acta decretaque forent, seque non ducem solum... esse belli.' There can be no doubt that 'auditis' was ἀκούσας to Livy: if 'forent' does not prove it, at least 'seque esse' is conclusive. I know no other instance of accusative and infinitive after auditis in Livy, (Curt. 5. 35. has 'Alexander, audito, Darium movisse... fugientem insequi pergit') but he repeats the 'dependent question' in 25. 13. 9. auditis quae... agerentur., 44. 30. 12. auditis quae... gererentur, though in 24. 23. 3. he writes the indicative—aud-

itis quae Syracusis acta erant. His usage also fluctuates with exponere. In 42. 21. 7. he has 'is expositis quas in Corsica res gessisset... triumphavit,' in 44. 35. 13. 'Octavium... exposito quid pararet Heraculum petere iubet,' (Curtius however 4. 13. 37. gives 'exposito quod nuntiatum erat'), and 43. 7. 7. 'exposuit... ea, quae Persei bello praestitissent...' but in 43. 3. 6. quae missa erant... exposuit.

After other verbs, as after exponere, in the ablative absolute, he puts the subjunctive e.g. 42. 25. 2. relatis ordine quae vidissent., and 44. 45. 10. editis quae agi... vellet., while subjunctives also occur in 43. 11. 2. legatos... miserunt, qui comperta quae agerentur referret., and after edita erant in 45. 34. 4.

An instance like 22. 6. 8. 'ignari omnium quae post se agerentur' is a constructional confusion for which I can find no exact parallel.

I have already quoted 44. 35. 13. exposito quid pararet. It is unnecessary to observe that this device practically begins with Livy, (see Roby, § 1251) unless we include Caes. Bell. Gall. 7. 52. 'exposito, quid iniquitas loci posset' where most editions read 'exposuit.' He uses it not infrequently and employs both dependent question and accusative with infinitive after it e.g. 31. 39. 4. ad Pluinam est progressus nondum comperto, (= οὐπω πύθμενος) quam regionem hostes petissent., 33. 41. 5. cognito vivere Ptolomaeum., 37. 13. 5. cognito hostium naves ad Aethaliam stare... Corycum... traiecerunt., and 44. 28. 4. cognito deinde... quinquaginta onerarias... inclusas esse... onerarias, datis, qui prosequerentur, decem lembis in Macedoniam mittit. [Add 5. 19. 9. edicto ne quis... pugnaret, and 10. 36. 7. edicto ut... pro hoste haberetur, and 44. 7. 11. incerto quidnam agendum foret.]

The words 'datis qui prosequerentur lembis' lead to a final device which, perhaps, also begins with Livy (I find no instance in Sallust, Caesar or Nepos). I mean the reproduction of σπαρτίωτας διεβίβασεν προπέμψας οἰνους... παραστήσονταί by 'copias traiecit praemisissis, qui... animos conciliarent' as in 21. 23. 1. (cp. 39. 24. 10. missis qui prosequerentur...). Indeed in the last five extant Books of Livy there are at least seven instances viz. 40. 49. 5., 42. 38. 10., 43. 18. 6., 44. 23. 9., 44. 35. 2., 44. 46. 1., and 45. 32. 8., while cases of a similar nature are 40. 39. 5. haec nova adlata res omissis (= ἀφέντα), quae agere instituerat, Flaccum raptim deducere exercitum ex Celtiberia cum coegisset etc., and 41. 2. 11., 42. 31. 7., 42. 44. 8., 45. 28. 8.



On such occasions Caesar is most particular to avoid omitting the antecedent, or treating the relative clause as 'subjective,' e.g. Bell. Civ. 1. 24. Pompeius, *iis* rebus cognitis, quae *erant* ad Corfinium gestae, ... 2. 17. cognitis *iis* rebus, quae *sunt* in Italia gestae, ... 2. 18. cognitis *iis* rebus quae *sunt* gestae, ... and 3. 13. cognitis *iis* rebus, quae *erant*...gestae, ... and in cases like Bell. Gall. 2. 7. (cf. 1. 37, 2. 29., 6. 3., etc.) 'vicis aedificiisque, quos adire poterant, incensis, ad castra...contenderunt,' the noun always precedes the relative clause, and the step from 'incensis, quos adire poterant, vicis' to 'incensis quos vicis adire poterant'—the

genesis, probably, of Livy's method, as in 42. 21. 7. expositis quas in Corsica res gessisset—never, perhaps, suggested itself to Caesar: at the same time Bell. Civ. 3. 78, quique erant ex vulneribus aegri, depositis approximates to the Livian usage, as also a similar instance in Nep. Lys. 1. 5. undique, qui Atheniensium rebus studuissent, eiectis, decem delegerat...quibus summum imperium potestatemque omnium rerum committeret.

H. DARNLEY NAYLOR.

ORMOND COLLEGE,  
MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY.  
January, 1901.

## REVIEWS.

### TUCKER'S *PROEM TO PLATO'S REPUBLIC*

*The Proem to the Ideal Commonwealth of Plato.* With Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes by T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D. (Camb.), Hon. Litt.D. (Dublin). 6s.

PROFESSOR TUCKER deserves to be congratulated on a careful and scholarly piece of work. It may indeed be doubted whether the first book of the *Republic* with its difficult and sometimes sophistical reasoning is altogether suitable as an introduction to the study of the so-called Socratic dialogues, but there was room for such an edition as Professor Tucker has undertaken, and he has done his work well. If the present reviewer has occasion to differ from him on a good many points, I hope it will not be set down to the proverbial jealousy of the Hesiodic potter, but rather to a desire to reach the truth. In the interpretation of Plato, as most Platonic students will agree, Truth lies too often *ἐν βυθῷ*, and it needs the cooperation of several independent workers to bring it to the surface.

The text of Professor Tucker's edition is, in the best sense of the word, conservative. He has resisted the temptations to which Herwerden and others of the Dutch school of criticism have constantly succumbed, and preferred sober and sensible exegesis to hasty and ill-considered 'emendation.' A distinguished Platonic scholar has somewhere said that the first duty of Plato's editors will always be to eject the glosses and adscripts which disfigure the text, and has set the example by the plentiful use of square

brackets, which, as he himself most truly observes, 'nemini nocent.' The edition before us avoids this error, and reasonable scholars will experience a sense of relief when they find the characteristic peculiarities of Platonic style for once religiously preserved and conscientiously explained, instead of ever listening to the wearisome cry 'Apage putidum interpretamentum!' wherever Plato is more than usually Platonic. In the matter of orthography, indeed, Professor Tucker follows the new lights. We find for example *ἡγήμενος*, *ἀπότρεσον*, *φιλονεικείν*, *ἀξιοίῃ*, *ὄντων* where Paris A has *εἰρημένος*, *ἀπότισον*, *φιλονεικείν*, *ἀξιοί*, *ἐστωσαν* (or *ἐστῶν*). In most of these and similar cases the evidence of Inscriptions may be quoted in favour of the new spelling, but I do not find sufficient evidence—apart from the *ipse dixit* of Cobet and his followers—to justify us in everywhere rejecting the contracted optative singular in *-οι*, which is, to say the least, the common spelling in Plato's best MSS. In the imperative, *ὄντων* is of course abundantly attested by Inscriptions; but is there a single instance in which MSS. preserve the form? The fact is that the relationship between the spelling of literary and inscriptional documents deserves a more thorough investigation than it has yet received, and it should be remembered that Plato's dialect in particular is by no means a mere copy of the vernacular, but a highly literary idiom in which there are not a few survivals of so-called Ionic and poetical forms of words. See Hirzel *Der Dialog* i. pp. 246–250 nn. In the



meantime Professor Tucker seems to me to be on the whole consistent in his employment of a spelling which at all events probably comes nearer to that of Plato than the spelling of the MSS. It is, however, surely an error to maintain the old distinction between ἔγγονος 'descendant' and ἔκγονος 'child' (364 E). A reference to Meisterhans-Schwyzler *Gr. d. Att. Inschr.* p. 107 will show that ἔγγονος and ἔκγονος are in reality only two ways of spelling the same word: and indeed in 364 E the meaning 'son' or 'child' is alone appropriate.

To pass to matters of more general interest.

I am glad to see that Professor Tucker retains the reading of the best MSS. in 349 D ὁ δὲ μὴ εὐκείναι, 363 A ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐδοκίμειν ὄντα τῷ δικαίῳ and 365 B ἐὰν καὶ μὴ δοκῶ. In defence of ὁ δὲ 'the other' he might have referred to 339 E (τοῖς δὲ for τοῖς δὲ ἀρχομένοις), 343 D, and ix. 587 B. The scribe in A understood ὁ δὲ in the same way; for a pause is inserted in that MS. after δὲ. It is matter for regret that recent editors have adopted the cumbrous and cacophonous reading of Stephanus ὁ δὲ μὴ, μὴ εὐκείναι. In 363 A ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐδοκίμειν ὄντα τῷ ἀδίκῳ has the authority of some inferior MSS., but Professor Tucker does well to revert to the most authoritative reading τῷ δικαίῳ. A careful examination of the argument proves that τῷ ἀδίκῳ is indefensible. Much the same may be said of the reading ἐὰν μὴ καὶ δοκῶ in 365 B. Professor Tucker is also right in his explanation of βλάψεν (364 B) as '(they undertake) to injure,' but he is mistaken when he supposes that this interpretation is new, for it is given by Schneider in his *Additamenta* p. 11. Good as Professor Tucker's work is, I venture to think that it would have been still better if there were more evidence that he had carefully studied the literature of the subject. Not to speak of the many monographs in which special points are discussed and illustrated, I do not find any indication of such a study of Schneider's admirable edition and translation as might reasonably be expected of an editor even of part of the *Republic*, and there appears to be no sign of any acquaintance with Schneider's *Additamenta*.

The grammatical notes are for the most

part excellent, and there is no edition of Books I. and II. in which so much attention is paid to the explanation of Plato's language. Of positive errors—as they seem to me—I have noted few. One is the explanation given of κρίσιν in ii. 360 D τὴν δὲ κρίσιν αὐτὴν τοῦ βίου περί ᾧ λέγομεν, ἐὰν διαστησώμεθα τὸν τε δικαιοτάτον καὶ τὸν ἀδικοτάτον, οὐκ ἔσόμεθα κρίναι ὁρθῶς. Professor Tucker translates τὴν κρίσιν αὐτὴν as 'the actual (practical) choice,' but the meaning surely is 'we shall be able to give our judgment' etc.: compare ἢν ἀμφότεροι—κρίνονται and εἰς τὴν κρίσιν ἐκκαθαίρει in 361 D. There are of course many other passages in which it is permissible to differ from the editor, such as for example 331 B, where I believe οὐκ ἐλάχιστον agrees with τοῦτο, 336 B (ἦκεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς), and 351 B εἰ μὲν ὡς σὺ ἀρτί ἔλεγες ἔχει, ἡ δικαιοσύνη σοφία), where the MS. reading may be defended by ii. 359 B and ix. 589 D. In particular, Professor Tucker's suggestions on the text, few in number though they are, should be received with caution. They will be found on pp. 94, 96, 126, 181 and 215 of his edition.

The Introduction gives a tolerably full account of the argument, interspersed with occasional illustrations from other dialogues of Plato and elsewhere. There is also a succinct account of the characters and a few paragraphs on the 'Composition of the *Republic*.' Professor Tucker holds that 'the first book, approached whether from the point of view of (a) the philosophy, (b) the handling, or (c) the language, implies a composition both early and independent. The internal evidence for this view is complete in every particular.' The subject is too vast and complicated to be adequately discussed within the limits of Professor Tucker's edition, still more in a short notice like the present. I can only say that so far from being 'complete in every particular,' the internal evidence in favour of the view which Professor Tucker adopts appears to me wholly inadequate to establish his case. The conservative view is defended with great ability and insight by Hirzel *Der Dialog* and by Joseph Hirmer in his *Entstehung und Komposition der platonischen Politeia*.

J. ADAM.

## JACKSON ON THE EUDEMIAN ETHICS.

*On some passages in the Seventh Book of the Eudemian Ethics.* By HENRY JACKSON, Litt.D. Pp. 52. Cambridge, 1900. 2s.

In discussing a great many passages from the Seventh Book of the Eudemian Ethics and in proposing new readings in most or all of them, Dr. Jackson has shown, it is needless to say, great knowledge, skill, and acuteness. No one can read what he has written without learning something from it or without admiring the insight which he constantly shows in dealing with a difficulty. His suggestions are always clever and sometimes very attractive. He seems, for instance, to suggest just what is wanted, when in 6, 12 and 13 he turns *ὀρεκτός* into *οὐκ ἐχθρός*: in 10, 11 *τῷ ἴσῳ* into *τόκον* (taking *κ* to = *σ* and the terminations to be immaterial): in 10, 31 *παντί τίνος* into *τί ἀντί τίνος*: in 3, 7 *διὸ εὐρηκέναι νεῖκος ὁ ἐρώμενος τοιαῦτ' ἂν οὐκ ἐρῶν λέγοι* into *διὸ εἴρηκεν Αἰνικός 'ἐρώμενος τοιαῦτ' ἂν, οὐκ ἐρῶν λέγοι*, thus introducing the comic poet Aeniacus (?), whose name we know, and a quotation from him. He makes much use of the theory of terminations abbreviated and then wrongly filled in again, and his applications of it are sometimes highly ingenious.

These proposals are very taking and may probably enough be right. On the other hand I am bound to say that many of the suggestions here made fail to persuade or even to attract me. Not only are they sometimes rather complicated, involving a good many hypotheses; but, what is a greater objection, the expression and meaning suggested are often to my mind unsatisfactory. On a bold conjecture which gives us a good meaning in a good shape we look with indulgence, even with admiration. But the conjecture is less defensible, when after all it gives a meaning or a form which is very much open to question. Such in my opinion

are 1, 14 *τὰ δὲ ἀχρηστα καὶ ἂν τοιαῦτ' αὐτῶν ἀποβάλλουσιν*, 'even those parts of themselves which are so': 6, 6 *εἰ δὴ τὸ συζῆν*: 10, 34 where *πρὸς τὸ πλούσιον εἶτα τί δοθέν* is converted into *πρὸς τὸ τί τοῖς ἀνέεται τί δοθέν*, the theory being that *τί τοῖς ἀνέεται τί δοθέν* is equivalent to *τί ἀντί τίνος ἀνέεται*. In 2, 20 I am unable to see the point of *ἕως ἂν ᾧσιν ἀκρατεῖς* (MSS. *ὥς ἂν*): *ib.* 38 *ἀγαπᾶται γὰρ τὸ εἰνοεῖν εὖ ὅζην δὲ μὴ* (MSS. *συζῆν δὲ μὴ*) is ingenious, but the sense supposed surely very doubtful: *ib.* 14 *ἔστιν ἢ διὰ* for *ἔστιν ἢ διὰ* needs a good deal of defence. Particularly I would venture to challenge Dr. Jackson's negative sentences, sometimes when he retains, sometimes when he alters the vulgate. It would take considerable argument to persuade one that either of the following is possible: 2, 20 *οὐδ' οὐ φιλοῦσι μὲν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν πρώτην φιλίαν*; 'it is not, however, true that they are not fond of one another': *ib.* 39 *τὰ μὲν ταχὺ γιγνόμενα μὴδὲ ῥαδίως οὐ*, 'what comes into existence slowly but surely.' I have like doubts about 9, 2 *τὸ μὲν ἔν, τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἐνός, οὐ δ' ἔν* (MSS. *οὐδέν*) in the sense of *ἐν δ' οὐ*.

Since these lines were written, we have had to deplore the death of the scholar to whom Dr. Jackson dedicates his book, Franz Susemihl, last editor (1884) of the *Eudemian Ethics*. An industrious, accomplished, and sagacious scholar, he laboured much at less well-known treatises like this, the *Magna Moralia* and the *Oeconomica*, as well as at the more familiar and attractive *Politics*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, and *Postics*. His edition of the last in particular was most serviceable, full of matter and yet handy. Invaluable also for its collection of facts is the elaborate two-volume *Literature of the Alexandrian Age*.

H. RICHARDS.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## APOLLO SMINTHEUS, RATS, MICE, AND PLAGUE.

THE story of a host of mice, or rats, or ants, who destroy an army by gnawing its bowstrings, is of such wide diffusion that I doubt if the animals can indicate plague,

either by metaphor (as Mr. Cree suggests) or as vehicles of infection. Field mice, who appear in the Egyptian legend of Herodotus (ii. 141) and in the name 'Smintheus,' are

remote from houses and infection. Rats, in China (Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, p. 13) are more suspicious. They also gnaw, in the story, the bowstrings of an army. But so do ants, in the Satapatha Brahmana, and ants do not convey infection or destroy standing corn. The legend of mice gnawing bowstrings occurs in the mythology of the Creek Indians of North America, and also in the mythic history of the Utes in the same country (Powell, *Report of Bureau of Ethnology*, l. 51). The Red Indians have

no bubonic plague. Here, then, in China, India, Egypt, and North America we have the same tale of an army defeated, or at least deprived of its artillery, by field mice, rats, or ants. I scarcely think that bubonic plague can have anything to do with this fable. Apollo of Sminthos is perhaps addressed in *The Iliad* merely as a local Apollo, without any thought of field mice or infection in the poet's mind.

A. LANG.

#### CLASSICS IN EDUCATION.

##### TWO LETTERS TO A CLASSICAL FRIEND.

##### II.

My Dear —,

I resume my story. A few years since I spent much time over Mommsen's *History of Rome*, and I then read again the two books of Livy which I had taken up so long before. Later on I turned to Caesar and read through the whole eight books of the Gallic War. These prose texts I was able to read, not without pains, but still as literature, and therefore with interest and a kind of pleasure. Then a friend of mine asked me to coach a medical student in two books of Horace, the third and fourth of the Odes. I objected that I had never read the Odes, but I was assured that my knowledge of Latin was sufficient for the purpose in hand. And so, in fact, it proved. Later still, I found a neighbour whose classical knowledge was about equal to my own, though gained by the reverse process, viz. a school education without the experience of the 'Varsity. He was willing to join me in reading through the four books of the Odes. Will you ask the result? I find that, so far as I am concerned, an Ode of Horace is the literary equivalent of a Chinese puzzle. With pains I can solve the puzzle or construe the text; but the result has neither beauty nor meaning. The whole thing leaves me weary and indifferent. One stanza of FitzGerald's Rubaiyat means more to me than all Horace put together. With the Horatian sentiment, the Horatian view of life, I have been familiar, oddly enough, from boyhood upward, when I learned it, not from Latin verse, but from the English prose of Thackeray. My failure to enjoy Horace (and Poetry, as

H. Nettleship said, is nothing, if it cannot be read and enjoyed) might be due to the fact that I was never properly grounded in Latin quantity and metre. And even today I can nowhere find any intelligible account of the relation between metre, quantity, and accent, in Greek and Latin verse. Consider for a moment what this means. From the sixteenth century to the close of the nineteenth, the classic poets have formed the staple of our higher education. The principal merit of classical poetry lies admittedly in the perfection of its form. And all poetry is primarily addressed to the ear. Yet our teachers are content to employ, both in Greek and Latin, a mode of pronunciation demonstrably barbarous; to perpetuate mechanically, in the case of Greek, a system of accents which in speech they ignore; while in Latin, whether spoken or written, accent is neglected altogether,<sup>1</sup> and though a theoretical importance is attached to quantity, it is not thought worth while to indicate it in writing, and in spoken utterance it is constantly set at naught. Such an habitual disregard of the essential conditions on which the apprehension of poetic art depends, goes far to justify the suspicion that the classics have neither been taught nor learned from the love of Poetry. If Latin lived on the lips of our teachers, I think the Odes of Horace would have conveyed more to me than they do.

My love for Lycidas and Adonais, and even my indifference to the *Bucolics* of Virgil, now led me to attempt Theocritus. I might as well have read so many consecutive pages of Liddell and Scott. And when

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Granger's letter in *C.R.* for June, p. 282.—Ed. *C.R.*

Liddell and Scott come in at the door, Poetry flies out at the window. Clearly Theocritus was a task beyond me, a task for the man who makes the study of classical literature the main business of his life. I must be content to let that go. I had wished to follow downwards the tradition of pastoral poetry. That must now be left to others.

On many accounts I was attracted to the Homeric poems. Their place at the beginning of Greek Literature, at the head of the epic tradition, their surpassing fame, the testimonies of Virgil, Milton and Shelley, all predisposed me in their favour. I hoped to gain from them fresh light on that antique world which I was studying in the pages of the Old Testament. The use made of Homer in the writings of Mr. Lang, as well as his own contagious enthusiasm, added to the inducements which led me to make this attempt. I was prepared by previous experience to find the difficulties considerable. I found them even greater than I anticipated. To read an epic in this way is like looking at a tapestry through a magnifying glass. You see the stitches, but the design is lost. Still, I have somehow made my way through the first twelve books of the *Iliad*. Frankly, I find it detestable. Let me remind you once more that I am not passing judgment, I do but register the results of much painstaking labour. The vile jargon in which the poem is composed, half barbarism and half affectation; the inextricable confusion of the accidence, which keeps the reader in continual perplexity and embarrassment; the peculiar vagueness and obscurity of the vocabulary, which prevent him from receiving any clear or forcible impression; the sickening conventionalities of the style, the rhetoric and rhodomontade, the verbosity and diffuseness, the set phrases and recurring formulae, the epithets without meaning and adjectives which go without any word; the interminable declamation, as of the professional reciter mouthing polysyllables at so much a verse; the uniform monotonous flow of twaddle disguised in verbiage; the disjointed succession of episodes, without unity, or plan or progress; the tedious elaboration of trivial detail; the prating heroes and ignoble gods; have left upon my mind a sense of absolute nausea. A plaster cast from Brucciani's exceeds the value of the whole.

Of course I do not put this forward as a final estimate of Homer. There may be something there that I do not see, there

NO. CXXXIV. VOL. XV.

may be a point of view from which all that disgusts me takes on a different aspect, or at least sinks into insignificance. What Homer conveyed to the native Greek, what it may convey in our own time to the classical scholar, to Mr. Lang or Prof. Jebb, I neither know nor care. My quarrel is with the almost inconceivable pedantry which has selected such a text as an instrument of ordinary education, or a means of literary culture. Out of my unlucky experience, one broad result has clearly emerged, and for myself at least, is henceforth placed beyond the possibility of doubt. *The classical literature is by its very nature a study for the specialist; no real appreciation of it is possible except to the specialist; and classical education is the education of the specialist or it is nothing.* A subject so alien, so remote, so difficult, so technical, so elaborate, so artificial, can have no value for the purpose of general education. The fallacy which you classical men commit is that of supposing that the ancient languages and texts have, or can have, for your pupils, the same significance that they bear to yourselves. While I am writing to you there comes to hand an advertisement of a method of instruction in pianoforte playing, which has for its object 'a complete separation of the *musical* and *mechanical* elements in teaching and practice.' I do not know whether this is practicable, but I am sure that the distinction drawn is of real importance for the teaching of literature, and this not only because (as I have sometimes said to you) a boy's classics are the equivalent of a girl's music, a conventional accomplishment to which education is sacrificed. For most of us, what is called classical education means no more than an imperfect, and therefore useless, acquisition of the mechanical or linguistic part of the study; and that which alone has, in the Greek sense, *musical*, or, as we say, literary value, is never really assimilated. The texts read remain not a literature but a chrestomathy. We ask for bread and you give us a stone. In order to impart, in nineteen cases out of twenty, a mere smattering of the grammar and rhetoric of two dead languages, you have sacrificed all the opportunities of culture and the faculties of the mind. So far from inspiring the love of letters, it would be nearer the truth to say that you have stifled it. So far from communicating a real knowledge of any part of literature, you have stopped the way with your costly and useless commodities, your display of learning with-

Y

out life. In the few cases where your system has the only success of which it is capable it produces the professional scholar, for whom I have no less respect than yourself, though perhaps a less exclusive admiration. In the vast majority it generates the prig, taught to flatter himself upon his acquirements and to prefer form to substance; the smug, versed in his especial task of book-learning and ignorant of all beyond; or the dunce, whose small capacity has been extinguished by those who should have developed it. If I am angry with such a system as this, if I regard it as an imposture bearing to a true system of education the relation that quackery bears to medicine, if I feel that its existence is the greatest obstacle to the diffusion of genuine culture, and that an incalculable liberation of mental energy would follow from its abolition, will you say that I am wrong? If so, you have to show that the ordinary schoolboy, the average undergraduate, gets more out of the classics than I do; and I fancy you will find this no easy task. Perhaps you will ask what I would substitute. Substitute what one can reasonably expect an intelligent lad to master, to assimilate, to retain, and to employ. For the faculties of the mind are cultivated by exercise, and they are exercised only upon

those objects which form an integral portion of our mental life. For you, my dear —, the Classics fulfil this function, but for most of us it can never be so. For most of us Greek has no more value than Hebrew. It is a mere clog on the mind's action. I would have a lad well grounded in Latin that he might the better comprehend the Latin element in the modern languages. Let him learn, if you like, to read with facility, and with a correct pronunciation, the Latin prose authors, but let the poets be read, if read at all, only in select passages which should be learned by heart, and declaimed aloud. French and German must form an essential part of modern education, and surely it is important to guide the youth into what is best for him in those literatures. I hold strongly that an educated man ought to comprehend the history of the language and literature which may properly be called his own. Surely here is scope enough. Would that I had employed upon such studies the hours that I have wasted on the barren pages of Horace and Virgil, of Euripides and Homer!

I am ever, my dear —,

Your candid friend,

G. H. S.

October, 1900.

## ARCHAEOLOGY

### OAK AND ROCK.

HEKTOR in his famous soliloquy before the final encounter with Achilles considers and rejects two possible means of avoiding the fight: (1) he could take refuge within the walls of Troy—but this would at once bring upon him the bitter reproaches of the Trojans; (2) he might lay aside his armour and make an offer of ample atonement to Achilles—but his overtures, he fears, would probably be futile; Achilles would only take advantage of his unarmed condition to slay him on the spot. At this point occur the obscure lines (*Il.* 22. 126 ff.) which form the subject of the present paper:—

οὐ μὲν πως νῦν ἔστιν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης  
τῷ δαριζέμεναι, ἃ τε παρθένος ἡϊεὸς τε,  
παρθένος ἡϊεὸς τ' δαρίζετον ἀλλήλων.

They are followed immediately by the heroic conclusion: 'Nay, better is it to charge

again and that with all speed; so shall we know to which of us two the lord of Olympus will give glory.'

Before discussing the meaning of these disputed verses it is worth while to note their external resemblance to some other passages in the context. Twice within the next seventy-five lines do we get the same telling but rather affected device of an echo-line, *i.e.* a line in which the principal words of a previous line are repeated and slightly expanded, the repetition in each case being asyndeton and double or antithetic in form. In 157 f. we read of Hektor and Achilles—

τῇ ῥα παραδραμέτην, φεύγων, ὃ δ' ὀπισθε διώκων  
πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφενγε, διώκει δέ μιν μέγ'  
ἀμείνων.

And in 199 f.—

ὥς δ' ἐν ὀνείρῳ οὐ δύναται φεύγοντα διώκειν  
οὐτ' ἄρ' ὃ τὸν δύναται ὑποφύγειν οὐθ' ὃ διώκειν.

a  
r  
b  
a  
'  
oo  
yo  
T  
35  
ea  
sit  
Bu  
the  
out  
hib  
for  
lite  
Wo  
bac  
of t  
of s  
in fi  
or r  
less  
the  
or  
Arc  
fanc  
D  
and  
that  
inter  
know  
expla  
he sa  
summ  
mank  
man  
and l  
silenc  
man i  
bare a  
chang



No exact parallel to these lines has been quoted, the nearest being the *epanalepsis* of *Il.* 23. 641 f., cp. 6. 395 f., 20. 371 f., *Od.* 1. 50 f. The peculiarity may therefore fairly be considered a mannerism, indeed a mark of the same hand. It betrays a somewhat pensive and reflective author, whose composition differs widely from the rapid, vigorous style of the *Mēvis*. Various editors and critics have felt this and sought to better the text by excising the individual lines 128 (Jordan, Leaf and Bayfield), 158 (Bekker, Düntzer, Nauck), 200 (Leaf, ed. 1): but there are grounds for supposing that the interpolation is more extensive—see Ameis-Hentze *Anhang*, viii. 8 ff.

The critical question does not, however, affect the exegesis of lines 126 f., with regard to which very diverse opinions have been held in modern times. Messrs Pratt and Leaf in their edition of 1880 translate: '*It is no time now to dally with him from oak tree or rock like youth with maiden, as youth and maiden hold dalliance together.*' To them, as to Van Lennep (on Hes. *Theog.* 35), the picture seemed to be that of happy ease in a forest, where youth and maiden sit by rocks or trees and talk together. But a love-scene with a rustic background, though all very well in Theocritus, is quite out of place in an early epic. Such an exhibition of romantic attachment is in fact foreign to the whole tone of pre-Alexandrian literature: vide the late E. F. M. Benecke's *Women in Greek Poetry*. Besides, Greek backgrounds are, so to speak, apt to be part of the foreground: I mean, they are as full of significance as the human figures acting in front of them. To explain the 'oak tree or rock' as mere properties would be hardly less absurd than to mistake the damsel in the tree on the exquisite coins of Gortyna or the rock-seated swain on those of Arcadia for idyllic creations of the artist's fancy.

Dr. Leaf duly repented of his hasty view and in his larger edition (1888) suggests that 'an oak and a rock may have been interlocutors in some primitive fable, the knowledge of which, if attainable, might explain all allusions. Suppose, for instance,' he says, 'that an oak and a rock dispute in summer time which of them is the father of mankind. The oak points to primitive man making his hut under its branches, and living upon its acorns. The rock is silenced till storms and winter come, when man is glad to take refuge, not under the bare and dying branches, but under the unchanging shelter of the rock, in whose

favour the controversy is thus decided.' Such a story might even be regarded as having relation to a conflict between the two ancient objects of human worship, "stocks and stones," which lie at the root of so many early religions. The belief that an oak or a rock was the actual progenitor of man is at least not inconsistent with what we know of primitive thought... The meaning of the present passage will be *I have not even so much as a tree or a rock, the traditional protectors of the human race, to shelter me so that I could hold converse at my ease—as easily as a pair of lovers dallying together.*' On this showing, then, the force of ἀπὸ δρυός and ἀπὸ πέτρης is limited to the main sentence and does not extend to the relative clause; the word ἀπὸ denotes 'from the shelter of'; while oak and rock are specified as totems, or at least as objects at once natural and supernatural, connected with man by the closest ties of worship or even kinship, and therefore bound to assist him in his hour of need. All this is, no doubt, possible; though, as Dr. Leaf himself admitted, it 'can have no other support than that it would explain the passages where the phrase in question occurs.' It may, however, be asked whether the meaning thus obtained really suits the situation described by the poet. 'I wish I had a divine or semi-divine shelter, that from it I might parley with Achilles being as much at my ease the while as lover and lass.' But surely a man in mortal peril would not think of insisting on perfect tranquillity; commonplace security would satisfy him. And if Hektor had even commonplace security, we may be certain that he would drop all thoughts of parley: *a fortiori*, if he bore a charmed life in the shadow of a sacred oak or rock, he would not talk of making overtures to Achilles.

Some such considerations probably suggested themselves to Dr. Leaf; for in the joint edition which he brought out with Mr. Bayfield ten years later (1898) he materially modifies the hypothesis. The editors translate: '*Surely in no wise now may I begin with the oak or the rock and chat with him, like a youth and a maid,*' adding 'i.e. he will not listen to a long story from me "beginning at the Deluge," as we say... It looks as though some ancient fables or myths about the Rock and Oak had come to be referred to proverbially to indicate any long-winded story, just as we say "a cock-and-bull story," meaning a silly and false one. What the original stories may have been it is hardly worth while to guess.' We remark

that Dr. Leaf has apparently abandoned the idea that the proverbial oak and rock refer to early objects of worship or to traditional progenitors: 'the original reference,' he says, 'is altogether obscure.' He now treats 'oak and rock' as a synonym for any long-winded tale without risking a guess as to its antecedents. But why 'long-winded'? The epithet begs the question. Again, is *δαρίζω* *ἀπό* *τινος* normal Greek for 'I chat, starting from the topic of'? Either *ἐκ*, as in Theocr. 17. 1 and Arat. *phaen.* 1 *ἐκ* *Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα*, or an adverb in *-θεν*, as in *Od.* 8. 500 *ἐνθεν ἰλών*, would be more natural.

Göttling (on Hes. *Theog.* 35) found in the oak and rock an allusion to the earliest oracles of the Greeks, the *ὑψίκομος* *δρῦς* of Dodona (*Od.* 14. 328, 19. 297) and *Πυθὼ πετρήεσσα* (*Il.* 9. 405). This allusion, he thought, when stereotyped as a proverb, was applicable in 'eo genere suasionum admonitionumque, quod ad suscipiendum aliquid vel ad abstinendum a proposito magnopere impelleret.' He paraphrases our passage: 'si vellem cum Achille non armis, sed verbis contendere et confabulari, quemadmodum cum virgine amasius, non ille mea verba sic veneraretur, ut voces quasi oraculorum audire sibi videretur.' This presumably implies the translation: *It is not now possible to make to him as an oracle from oak or rock such soft speeches as man and maid, man and maid make one to the other.* But *ἀπὸ δρῦός . . . δαρίζεσθαι* would thus have to mean 'to make soft speeches with all the authority of an oak-oracle'! Besides, as Preller in *Philologus* 1852, p. 21 rightly urged, a general term like *πέτρα* could not without further qualification denote a particular place like Delphi. Equally impossible was Hermann's explanation (*Opusc.* vi. 155). He too believed in an allusion to oracles, but thought that the expression 'oak or rock' had come to connote *μᾶψ αὐτως* because men did not know who uttered the oracular voice. To which Göttling retorted: 'hoc dignum erat Menandri aevo.' Both scholars were probably misled by Plat. *Phaedr.* 275 B, where Sokrates for his own purposes brings our proverb into connexion with the oak of Dodona: *οἱ δὲ γ', ὦ φίλε, ἐν τῷ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Δωδωναίου ἱερῷ δρῦος λόγους ἐφήσαν μαντικούς πρώτους γενέσθαι. τοῖς μὲν οὖν τότε, ἅτε οὐκ οὔσι σοφοῖς ὥσπερ ὑμεῖς οἱ νέοι, ἀπέχρη δρῦος καὶ πέτρας ἀκούειν ὑπ' εὐηθείας, εἰ μόνον ἀληθῆ λέγοιεν.*

Ameis-Hentze were better advised in seeking the origin of the proverb in the early mythology of Greece. Commenting on *Il.* 22. 126 they say: '*ἀπὸ δρῦος οὐδ' ἀπὸ*

*πέτρας*, cp. τ 163 *οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρῦος ἔσσι παλαιφάτου, οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρας*, a proverbial phrase referring to myths which told how men sprang originally from trees and rocks. Here, however, the word *ἀπὸ* marks the point of departure (*Ausgangspunkt*) for *δαρίζεσθαι*, *starting from*, cp. *ἐνθεν ἰλών* in θ 500. The sense is: It is impossible now to prate at length to him of old and well-worn themes, such as how the war began and how we might settle it peaceably by restoring Helen (vv. 114-116); it would produce about as much effect upon him as though I were to tell him some old-world tale like those told by a man and a maid in their confidential chat.' This explanation is, I believe, on the right track. But it still presents some grave difficulties: (1) Was the beginning of the war sufficiently remote to be described by a phrase importing an antediluvian antiquity? And (2) why should young men and maidens in their lovers'-talk waste time by telling each other old-world tales? Was this human nature even in heroic days? Again, the elucidation of the passage is incomplete unless we provide some answer to the further questions: (3) How comes *ἀπὸ* to be used of the *Ausgangspunkt* of *δαρίζεσθαι*? Ameis-Hentze cite no parallel, and we have seen that other modes of expression would have been more natural. Finally (4) what is the exact relation between this passage and the other epic passages in which the proverb is found?

I agree with Ameis-Hentze in holding that the starting-point of our solution must be a comparison of *Od.* 19. 162 f. Penelope there urges the disguised Odysseus to tell her who he is:

*ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς μοι εἰπὲ τὸν γένος, ὅππότεν ἔσσι· οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρῦος ἔσσι παλαιφάτου οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρας.*

Odysseus declares that he is a Cretan of Knosos, where Minos once reigned *Διὸς μεγάλου δαριστής* (179), and adds that his father was Deukalion the son of Minos. Now it is not a little remarkable that the word *δαριστής*, which occurs nowhere else in the *Odyssey*, should here too be found in the neighbourhood of the oak-and-rock proverb. The coincidence encourages us to interpret the *Iliad* passage by the help of this. And in this there is fortunately no doubt as to the meaning of the phrases *ἀπὸ δρῦος* and *ἀπὸ πέτρας*. They denote lineal descent from oak and rock.<sup>1</sup> At the same time the

<sup>1</sup> Ample evidence of this belief on Greek soil has been collected by Preller in *Philologus* 1852 p. 1 ff., Welcker *Griechische Götterlehre* i. 777 ff., G. F. Schömann *Opuscula* ii. 125 ff., and others.

context shows that Penelope regards such lineage as fable rather than fact. Her words may be paraphrased: 'Tell me your pedigree; for presumably you have ancestors whose names you can quote and do not accept as your forbears the stocks and stones of which the old saw speaks.' The sceptical tone of the last line proves the extreme antiquity of the expression. If at the time when the *Odyssey* was composed belief in such descent was clearly on the wane, that belief must have been, to say the least of it, prehomeric. But to what prehomeric source can we look for its exemplification? Odysseus himself supplies an answer. Taking a hint from Penelope's final fling, he feigns to be a Cretan of Knosos. Thanks to the researches of Mr. Arthur Evans it is now notorious that at Knosos there flourished in prehistoric times a 'tree and pillar cult,' in which both stocks and stones were the symbols of the Cretan Zeus (*J.H.S.* xxi. 99 ff.). Minos, according to our earliest source (*Il.* 13. 449 ff.), was the son of this Zeus, ὃς πρῶτον Μίνωα τέκε Κρήτη ἐπίουρον | Μίνως δ' αὖ τέκεθ' υἱὸν ἀνύμωνα Δευκαλίωνα. He was therefore in the strict sense of the words ἀπὸ δρυός and ἀπὸ πέτρης. Mr. H. R. Hall (*The Oldest Civilisation of Greece* p. 294) pertinently asks whether the back of the famous throne in the palace of Knosos, fashioned in the shape of an oak-leaf, may not be the emblem of Zeus. If so, the king of Knosos actually sat on a throne that notified his descent from the sacred tree. Again, I would point out that the name Deukalion in this connexion may be significant. Was there in Crete also a legend of men sprung from stones? However that may be, it is at least clear (1) that in this old-world phrase ἀπὸ denotes lineal descent from stocks and stones, and (2) that in the Homeric age such descent had come to be received with incredulity. It is also suggested, if not proved, by the context (3) that δαριστής means one who talks familiarly with another, a party to a duologue.<sup>1</sup>

In applying these results to Hektor's words in the *Iliad* it will be convenient to begin with the force of the verb δαρίζω. For the point of the passage, unless I am mistaken, lies in the appropriateness of this verb to two very different scenes: (a) a parley between a couple of warriors, and (b) a tête-à-tête between two lovers. The word seems to have covered originally any

'palaver' or 'talky-talky.' But it early acquired narrower and more specialised meanings. All the examples in the *Iliad* can be grouped under two denotations according as they have reference to the intercourse (a) of war, or (b) of love. On the one hand (a) in *Il.* 17. 227 f. Hektor concludes a harangue to his men—

τῷ τις νῦν ἰθὺς τετραμμένος ἢ ἀπολίσθω  
ἢ ἐ σωθήτω· ἢ γὰρ πολέμου δαριστής.

And in *Il.* 13. 291 Idomeneus the Cretan speaks of Meriones as

πρόσσω ἱεμένοιο μετὰ προμάχων δαριστύν.

On the other hand (b) in *Il.* 6. 516 Hektor ἢ δαρίζε γυναικί (the famous colloquy of vv. 405–494); and in *Il.* 14. 216 f. we are told of Aphrodite's *kestos*:

ἐνθ' ἐνὶ μὲν φιλότῃς, ἐν δ' ἔμπερος, ἐν δ' δαριστὺς  
[πάρφασις, ἢ τ' ἐκλεψε νόον πύκα περ φρονέοντων.]

The passages cited under (a) are commonly taken as metaphorical, the metaphor being drawn from usage (b). They would thus be examples of grim irony: 'such is the coquetry of war,' 'to join those who are flirting in the front ranks.' But it is possible, or even probable, that they refer rather to the preliminary brags and boasts so characteristic of a fight between Homeric chieftains: 'such is the language of the battlefield,' 'to join those who challenge each other in the front ranks.' In either case it appears that δαρίζω is regularly used of a parley between chiefs as well as of a talk between lovers.

We have then as materials for our explanation, in the first place the force of δαρίζω—it denotes a palaver, whether military or amatory; and in the second place the force of ἀπὸ δρυός κ.τ.λ.—it denotes descent from oak or rock, mythical ancestors not to be taken too seriously. But, it will be asked, what has mythical ancestry to do with δαριστής bellicose or otherwise? To this question a modern Greek would probably answer 'Nothing': an ancient Greek would certainly have answered 'Much.' Few topics are so frequent in the speeches that prelude an epic combat as the high lineage, real or fictitious, of the combatants. An interesting parallel to our passage is to be found in Longfellow's *Courtship of Miles Standish*. The poet, describing how the Indians 'began to parley with Standish,' makes the chief Watawamat boast that 'He was not born of a woman, | But on a mountain, at night, from an oak-tree riven

<sup>1</sup> With Διὸς μεγάλου δαριστής cp. Ex. 33. 11 'The Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend.'

by lightning.' Again, a betrothal in Homeric times would certainly have included a minute investigation of the family tree. Even in the Theocritean *Ῥοριστὺς* (note the title) we find the following instructive passage (Theocr. 27. 41 ff.):—

## ΔΑΦΝΙΣ

Δάφνις ἐγώ, Λυκίδας τε πατήρ, μήτηρ δὲ Νομαίη.

## ΚΟΡΗ

ἐξ εὐγενέων· ἄλλ' οὐ σέθεν εἰμὶ χερείων.

## ΔΑΦΝΙΣ

οἶδ', ἄκρα τιμὴ ἐσσί· πατήρ δέ τοι ἐστὶ Μενάλκας.

Rivalry of this sort rather than any softer sentiment is what we should expect from the *παρθένος ἡθεός τε* of Hektor's speech.<sup>1</sup>

I conclude that the general sense of the *Iliad* passage may be given thus: 'Useless to attempt a parley with Achilles, bragging of descent from mythical ancestors! Such bragging may suit the credulity of young men and maidens. But for Hektor and Achilles only one course is open—instant fight.' The literal rendering will be: 'By no means now may one parley with him of descent from stock or stone, as lad and lass, lad and lass parley each with the other.'

This translation indicates one remaining difficulty. I have assumed that *ἀπὸ δρυός*... *δαριζέμεναι* can be used for 'to parley of descent from' etc., as though it were *ὡς ἀπὸ δρυός ὄντα δαρίζειν*. The juxtaposition of *ἀπὸ δρυός* without a participle and of *δαριζέμεναι* is, I fully admit, awkward. But it may be contended that after using *ἐστὶν* in one sense the poet would hardly have used *ὄντα* in another. Moreover a similar ellipse is found, oddly enough with the same verb, in the *Hymn to Hermes*, 170 ff. *βέλτερον ἡμᾶτα πάντα μετ' ἀθανάτοις δαρίζειν*, | *πλούσιον, ἀφνειόν, πολυλήμον* (sc. *ὄντα*), | *ἥ κατὰ δῶμα | ἄνθρωπ' ἐν ἡρώεσσι θαασσέμεν*. See further Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, §§ 875, 902, 911.

A word in conclusion with regard to the subsequent history of the expression. From 'boasted ancestors of a fictitious sort' to 'boasted origins of a fictitious sort' is not a far cry. And the proverb was extended to include the latter as well as the former. But this extension rendered the preposition

*ἀπὸ* sometimes inappropriate. Accordingly in Hes. *Theog.* 35 we read *ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρὺν ἢ περὶ πέτρην*; The author has been relating the story of his original inspiration by the Muses on Mt. Helikon: suddenly he stops with this line, which means 'Why dilate on first beginnings of this conventional and incredible kind? Why not proceed to my main theme without further delay?' In *Iliad* 22. 126 *ἀπὸ* not *περὶ* is used because the thought of actual descent is still present. The Hesiodic rhapsodist substitutes *περὶ* for *ἀπὸ*, because 'oak' and 'rock' to him mean early origins in general with the same connotation *ἀπίστως ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐκνεκικῆκότα*. We have perhaps a parallel to this later abandonment of *ἀπὸ* in the remarkable series of proverbs *ἀπὸ Ναννάκου* (Macar. ii. 23, Suid. s.v. *Νάννακος*), *τὰ ἀπὸ Ναννάκου* (Zenob. vi. 10 cod. B, cp. Apostol. xv. 100), *τὰ ἐπὶ Ναννάκου* (Macar. viii. 4, cp. Steph. Byz. s.v. *Ἰκόνιον*), where *ἀπὸ Ναννάκου* apparently denotes the pedigree of the early Phrygian kings, and *τὰ ἀπὸ Ναννάκου* is used to describe the primeval institutions of Nannakos—a thought more fittingly expressed, though in less consecrated language, by *τὰ ἐπὶ Ναννάκου*.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

## DE VISSER

## ON GREEK INFRA-HUMAN GODS.

*De Graecorum diis non referentibus speciem humanam*. M. W. DE VISSER. Leyden. 1900 pp. i-iv, 1-283. 4 M. 50.

THE fact that M. de Visser's book is a 'doctor-dissertation' would seem to indicate that he is, relatively speaking, but at the commencement of his researches in Comparative Religion. So much the more credit is in that case due to him for having combined the rôles of classical scholar and anthropologist so successfully as he has done. That the scholar should predominate over the anthropologist is but natural, seeing that he has set himself what is primarily a scholar's task, namely the compilation of *Schrift-quellen* to illustrate Greek Religion on what might be loosely termed its 'pre-anthropomorphic' side. Book I. (pp. 3-31) and Book III. (pp. 209-70) are, as in bulk, so in intrinsic value decidedly inferior to Book II. (pp. 32-208). The former of these supplementary parts enunciates the

<sup>1</sup> There is, perhaps, a reminiscence of our passage in the *Hymn to Hermes*, 54 ff., where we have another combination of *δαριστὺς* and pedigree: *ἄειδεν... ἀμφὶ Δία Κρονίδην καὶ Μαϊάδα καλλιπείδιον*, | *ὡς πάρος ὀρίζεσκον ἑταίρειν φιλόητι*, | *ἦν τ' αὐτοῦ γένεθ' ὀνομακλυτὸν ὀνομαζών*.



author's anthropological presuppositions; the latter offers a *vindematio prima* of conjectural elucidations. Now the methods of the palaeontologist of culture are unhappily by no means so exact as to enable any given fragment of bone to be with certainty referred to this or that typical form of skeleton. Moreover many of the fragments collected by M. de Visser are woefully minute and battered. Hence it were manifestly unfair to expect from our author any connected account of the 'origins' of Greek Religion as such. It is in fact rather as a protest against 'philological' attempts to do this very thing that his work claims our favourable regard. Viewed in this light, namely as an almost monotonous, but by no means unnecessary, reiteration of the caution 'For Greek Religion *vide* General Anthropology,' his supplementary books ought at least to serve to remind the purely classical scholar of his limitations. On the other hand, the contribution in the way of raw material is so lucidly presented as to offer the greatest assistance to the student whose business is the interpretation of 'survivals,' so long as the latter possess even a moderate acquaintance with the Greek language.

To deal first with Book II—four categories of sacred objects are recognised, Stones, Stocks, Trees and Animals. The first class ranges from ἀργοὶ λίθοι to cones, obelisks, pyramids, columns, hermae, and so forth. It was, perhaps, natural to consider in this context the ἐρμῆα, or roadside cairns to which each wayfarer was wont to add his quota; though, according to M. de Visser's hesitating conjecture, the stones are but a substitute for the gifts once showered on certain holy spots, 'totemistic altars' or what not, and are thus in themselves not sacred. He may be referred to Mr. Hartland's *Legend of Perseus* (2. 204–11) for a far more probable explanation of the rite in question. If the stones be supposed (like the grass, twigs, etc., similarly heaped up by savages) to represent a formal means of communion with a local 'power,' such a power being always more or less of a δύναμις τῶν ἐναντίων, a being equally capable of beneficent or malevolent action, we are at once furnished with a general clue, and in particular are enabled to bring the ἐρμῆα into relation with the widespread custom, possibly alluded to in Eustath. ad *Od.* 16. 471, of piling a cairn on the murderer's grave (as may likewise be done in regard to the grave of a famous warrior, cf. Adair. *Hist. Am. Ind.* 184).

The class of Stocks is provisionally distinguished, because the author—wisely, as I think—inclines to make the connection hinted at in Tyler's compound expression 'stock-and-stone-worship' rather than to explain ξόανα and the like in terms of Tree-worship understood as the cult of certain vegetation-spirits. Under this head we are presented with a rather miscellaneous group of facts, including τροπαῖα, παλλᾶδια, and the wooden phallus of Hermes Cyllenius.

As regards Tree-worship proper, the data, though numerous, are unfortunately somewhat lacking in illustrative quality, being in considerable part supplied by coins, gems, wall-pictures, and names of more or less doubtful etymology and history.

The section on Animal-worship, on the other hand, provides us with much that excites, if it does not go far towards satisfying, the passion for interpretation. Instances are given of relationship being claimed with animals (p. 129), of taboos on killing and eating them (*ib.* and p. 132), and of their burial with solemn rites (p. 133 and p. 135), which at once suggest an endless number of parallels taken from savage custom. It is a pity, by the way, that the indirect evidence adduced in Book III. in support of the view that the Greeks were addicted to 'Totemism' was not given a substantial place in this section. It might likewise have thrown light on the many-sided character of Greek Animal-worship if the writer had not limited himself rigidly to the phenomena of cult, but had also levied a contribution on mythology with its 'Gorgons and Hydras and Chimaeras dire.'

Speaking generally, M. de Visser's citations are well-chosen, well-arranged, and copious. His list is, perhaps, not ideally complete. For example, Mr. L. R. Farnell points out to me the omission in connection with Totemism of any mention of the Ὀφιογενεῖς (Pliny, N. H. 28. 30, Strabo, p. 588. Varro ap. Prisc. 10. 32); in connection with the question of sacred boundary-stones discussed pp. 212–3 of a reference to Demosth. *Halonnes*. p. 86 βωμὸς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὁρίου; and, as regards the ἐρμῆα, of any allusion to another scholiast on *Od.* 16. 471 who, taken together with Eustathius *ad loc.*, suggests the curious problem whether the Roman milestones may not have had a religious origin. Still, as it stands, the 'heap of witness' to M. de Visser's industry is of goodly proportions and of the greatest value.

As to Book I, my criticism put shortly



amounts to this, that M. de Visser, finding himself forced to choose amongst a number of representative theories, has, for brevity's sake, if not through excess of faith, ventured to give to the fruits of his eclecticism an appearance of system and finality such as the present state of our knowledge most certainly does not warrant. Thus he dogmatically posits Animism as the basis of universal religion without noting the ambiguity of the term as used by anthropologists. He does not distinguish between the attribution of mere life, and that of soul or spirit, to material objects, with the result that he is forced quite unnecessarily to postulate an 'animus' which inhabits the aerolite or the stone held sacred in virtue of its peculiar shape. Or again, Fetichism as defined by Schulze and Totemism as explained in Frazer's manual are made mutually exclusive as relating respectively to individual material objects and to classes, whether of these or of animals and plants. But how can he stomach such a fact as that the sun is with Schulze a fetish and with Frazer a totem? Once more as regards Animal-worship, he has borrowed from Frazer's *Golden Bough* the notion of a plurality of irreducible forms of theriomorphic cult: yet he cannot refrain from hunting in company with Jevons after the mare's nest of a universal homogeneous 'totemistic religion.' In a word, our author seems scarcely to realise that these and such as these are but the temporary labels marking the capacious pigeon-holes into which anthropologists are still busy shooting their raw facts almost at random; and that they can contain in themselves no principle of explanation so long as their connotation remains almost wholly indeterminate as at present.

That the elucidations which compose Book III are sparse and tentative constitutes in my opinion a proof of the author's good sense and moderation. His researches yield virtually no crucial instances in the matter of origins; for these he must go to savagery, and, I would add, to savagery as studied at first-hand. Meanwhile, he has little to say about Stone-worship that carries us back behind the bare facts as cited by his authorities. His attempt to connect the veneration of Trees and Animals with Manes-worship comes to nothing. Or again, as regards his laborious inquiries concerning Totemism, is there any use in trying to find it in the background of Greek or Indo-Germanic religion till one knows more precisely what one is looking for? To take but one example of the looseness of his argument,

he puts down the ceremonious burial of *cicadae marinae* practised by the Seriphians (pp. 226-7 cf. p. 135) as totemistic on the strength of a parallel custom in respect to owls quoted in Frazer's *Totemism* from Samoa. Yet in Tylor's *Remarks on Totemism*, with which M. de Visser is presumably acquainted, since he quotes it in his notes to pp. 13, 14, it is shewn at some length that the ascription to the Samoans of totems in any sense of that much-abused word is an utterly gratuitous piece of hypothesis (J. A. I. New Ser. 1. 142-3).

Meanwhile, the section on the progress of anthropomorphism in Greek religious thought stands by itself as a valuable contribution to a subject which it is well within the compass of the classical scholar to illustrate and explain. It is just at the point at which customary religion becomes markedly self-conscious and self-justificatory that the student of savage beliefs comes to the end of his clues. The actual transition to what may be called dogmatic religion presents a relatively untouched problem. Would he but focus his energies on this special point, M. de Visser with his knowledge of the facts, his *flair* for the primitive, his distrust of symbolistic interpretations, and his power of piercing through aetiological pretence, is capable of rendering the greatest of service to Comparative Religion.

R. R. MARETT.

#### RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN ROME.

(See *C. R.* 1901, pp. 85, 136.)

SINCE the date of my last report (the middle of January) there has been comparatively little of great importance to record in regard to the excavations of the Forum. The work has been progressing steadily, though perhaps a little slowly—owing chiefly to the bad weather of the past winter, which has more than once caused the inundation of the low-lying portions of the Forum. In December the pavement of the Basilica Julia was flooded for 2 or 3 days, and the Stile of the Comitium has been under water no less than three times. Much attention has been devoted to stratigraphic exploration and the investigation of the contents of the numerous wells which still continue to appear. Much time, too, has been spent in the strengthening of buildings which seemed to be in a dangerous condition, and in the construction of a retaining wall upon the north-

east side across the end of the Via Cavour, where the limit of the land at the disposal of the Government has been reached without its being at present possible to complete the exploration of the Basilica Aemilia.

### I.—*S. Maria Antiqua.*

The exploration of *S. Maria Antiqua* has been continued, with interesting results. Burial below the level of the pavement of the church was not at all uncommon; some of the bodies have been placed in sarcophagi of earlier date, others are enclosed in tombs of contemporary masonry. In the outer church these graves lie within the area of a large, open piscina or water tank about 30 Roman feet wide by 80 feet long, and about 4 feet in depth. The marble slabs of its pavement are still in part existing. The north-west and south-east sides, which were the longer, were decorated with very shallow niches, alternately rectangular and curved; the north-east end has an ornamental flight of steps in the centre, in which was placed the fountain-jet which filled the piscina (this arrangement is frequently seen at Pompeii) while at the south-west end a few steps descend into the piscina. The orientation of this watertank (about 35° east of north) seems to indicate that it belongs to the imperial palace of the first century. It corresponds with that of other walls immediately to the north-east, of the brick drain which runs beneath the floor of the Augusteum, of the wall behind the apse of *S. Maria Antiqua*, and finally with that of those walls of the palace of Caligula which date from the time of its original construction (see Lanciani, *Forma Urbis*, sheet 29, *Ruins and Excavations*, pp. 153–155). The evidence of the ruins themselves is confirmed by Suetonius, who tells us (Calig. 22) that Caligula ‘partem Palatii ad forum usque promovit.’

In the second century the Augusteum and the two halls connected with it were constructed upon a different orientation, and the piscina was partly destroyed by the concrete foundations which were sunk through it, what remains of it having been buried beneath the floor of the outer hall and thus preserved.

Lanciani has published an article on the subject of *S. Maria Antiqua* (*Bull. Com.*: 1900, 299 sqq.) in which he cites further evidence—if more were needed—for the correctness of the name now applied to the church, namely, the dedicatory inscription of a fresco on the left of the apse ‘s(an)c(t)ae.

d(e)i . [genetri]ci . sem[perque virgini mar]iae.

It may be mentioned that the whole of the frescoes which have been discovered in the church are being copied on the same scale as the originals and with the greatest care and precision, and that the paintings of the inner church will be protected by a permanent roof. An interesting parallel to them is to be found in those of the earlier church of *S. Saba* on the smaller Aventine the remains of which have been recently discovered beneath the pavement of the church of 1205 A.D. Some of these paintings date from the sixth century, others are of later date. (See *Not. Scavi*. 1901 p. 10. *Attenaeum*, 1901, May 25, 667.)

The interior of the Augusteum has also been excavated to the floor level, a long task now practically completed, which has as yet produced little of importance. Several pillars of opus mixtum of late date have been discovered, the *raison d'être* of which is not as yet clear.

The Augusteum and *S. Maria Antiqua* have a common façade towards the forum consisting of a line of seven brick pillars with brick columns, only slightly engaged, standing in front of them. The front wall of the hall which was converted into the church of the forty martyrs masks the last column to the south-east, and must therefore be of later date than the Augusteum. The space in front of this façade was used as a burying ground in connexion with the church of *S. Maria Antiqua*.

### II.—*Arch of Tiberius.*

A mass of concrete foundation, measuring about 20 ft. by 15 ft., has been unearthed in front (south-east) of the two south-westernmost arches of the supposed rostra of Caesar. This is attributed by Boni (*Not. Scavi* 1900, p. 632) to the Arch of Tiberius.

It is not the first time that this foundation has been discovered—it was brought to light in 1852, when the viaduct which carried the road over the Forum was constructed (*Monteroli Osservazioni sul Foro Romano*, p. 11. *Jordan Topographie I*<sup>2</sup>, p. 211). The fact that it does not stand quite on the line of the road which skirts the north-east side of the Basilica Julia is no objection to the identification, as it appears that in origin, at any rate, some of the Roman triumphal arches were not intended to allow of the regular passage of vehicular traffic. (*Jordan Topographie I*<sup>2</sup>, 306, 307). And the arch of Tiberius must have stood almost precisely in

this position, as is shown by the relief from the arch of Constantine (reproduced by Middleton, *Remains of Ancient Rome*, Vol. I, p. 259, fig. 34) which represents it as an arch with a single opening, situated between the Rostra,<sup>1</sup> and the Basilica Julia.

On the other hand, the fragments which were believed to belong to the inscription of this arch, and which were discovered precisely upon this spot, have, according to Mommsen (*Res gestae Divi Augusti*, ed. II, p. 126) no connexion whatever with it. If this be the foundation of the arch of Tiberius, it is difficult to see how Boni's theory as to the Rostra (see *C.R.*, 1901, p. 87) can be maintained. The arch in this position would have completely obstructed the south-western end of the Rostra of Caesar, and in that case we are again face to face with the necessity, if we accept Boni's theory, of supposing that, at some time or another, the semicircular structure faced with slabs of portasanta served as the Rostra. That this is impossible I have tried to show. (*loc. cit.*<sup>2</sup>) The construction of the concrete foundation of which we have been speaking led to the almost entire destruction of two of the small pits (*C.R.* 1900, p. 237) of which several have been found on the further side of the Forum. Traces of them were, however, recognisable, and the removal of the late pavement of the road skirting the north-east side of the Basilica Julia has led to the discovery of five more. Three of these, arranged at regular intervals, were, like the rest, empty; but the fourth, close to the south-easternmost of the row, and shallower than the rest (probably, therefore, of later date) contained a good deal of pottery of Roman date, including several cups with very small bowls, in shape somewhat resembling candlesticks, the use of which is uncertain.

The fifth, further on, has been found to contain pottery of Roman date, and wall plaster painted red. The discovery of more of these pits is to be anticipated.

Beneath this pavement was also found a fragment of the marble Forma Urbis, which had been used as a roofing slab in a small drain. This fragment bears the legend [th]

<sup>1</sup> i.e. the Rostra of opus quadratum.

<sup>2</sup> I should have made it clear that I agree with Nichols in considering the semicircular structure to be the Graecostasis—that is, the Graecostasis of the late Republic, constructed perhaps only a few years before Caesar removed the Rostra from the Comitium. The arched structure, considered by Boni to be the Rostra of Caesar, I believe to be the Graecostasis of the second century B.C. Where the Graecostasis of the imperial period (see Jordan *Topographie* I<sup>2</sup> p. 243) is to be placed, is a problem as yet unsolved.

ermae [agrip]pae, and is believed by Boni to have formed part, not of the plan set up by Septimius Severus and Caracalla, to which belong all the fragments hitherto discovered, but to an earlier form of the plan of the city, probably that of Vespasian, set up in the year 75 A.D. This view, which appeared in the daily press, and is repeated in the *Notizie degli Scavi* for December 1900, p. 634 (published in April), seems, however, to be incorrect. The main argument in its favour, that of the lettering of the inscription, was shown to be insufficient by Hülsen in a discussion of the subject at the German Archaeological Institute; and Lanciani in *Bull. Com.*, 1901, p. 3, *sqq.*, refuses to accept the earlier date. The peculiar interest of the fragment, according to its discoverer, was the fact that it represented the Pantheon at the time of the Flavii; but at that period the Pantheon, as Lanciani points out, was rectangular, not round. The edifice shown is certainly not the Pantheon of Hadrian, but, probably, the circular Caldarium of the Thermae of Agrippa, known as La Ciambella, though the representation is very inexact.

THOMAS ASHBY, JUN.

## MONTHLY RECORD.

### ITALY.

*Vetulonia*.—The excavations of 1899 have yielded extensive results of early finds of the usual types from these cemeteries. Most notable are two large gold fibulae of the 'boat' type with long sheath-like foot, decorated with granulated work and figures of animals; they are similar to some found two or three years ago (*C.R.* 1899, p. 187). The workmanship is good, but they are of comparatively late date. Another remarkable find is a large bronze disc with two large Sphinxes and two Gryphons in relief, confronted in pairs. Among the many bronze objects, mostly of familiar types, may be mentioned a bronze file exactly corresponding to the modern form, and a candelabrum on four human legs with a rude figure on the top, of a warrior with helmet and shield dancing.<sup>1</sup>

*Perugia*.—A very rich Etruscan tomb has been found, containing a sarcophagus with skeleton; in the ears were plain earrings, and on the forehead a magnificent frontlet of gold leaves, with an oval medallion in the middle. On the medallion is a winged goddess standing before a *cista*, holding a mirror: at each end of the frontlet is a marine monster, half-human, half fish, holding a fish in each hand. Round the sarcophagus were various bronze objects: a support in the form of a winged goddess holding two oil-flasks; at her feet a monster with dog's head, bird's body, and snake-tail coiled round her right foot; a broken patera, the handle in the form of a draped woman; and a mirror with incised design of Adonis (*At[ti]n[us]*) embracing a female figure

<sup>1</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, Oct. 1900.

who is inscribed with the name *Lasa Achunana*. Probably the design is an excerpt from a larger composition, and this name is by a mistake for Aphrodite.<sup>2</sup>

*Rome*.—An inscription has been found in exploring the sanctuary of Juturna which may be dated to B.C. 4. It runs: IM... | POTES · XVII | I | COLONIA · IV | TERTIA DECIM[A] | VTHINA · EX | INDULGENTIA · EIVS · AV[CTA]. The fact that in the titles of Augustus (and in his alone) the *tribunicia potestas* always comes last, allows us to identify him as the Emperor, and this is supported by the palaeography of the inscription.<sup>3</sup>

Among the discoveries in the exploration of the Rostra the following is of some interest. There were found a small flower from a capital in peperino, a larger flower from a Corinthian capital, and a fragment of the decoration of the *transenna* or marble screen, all covered with remains of *opus albarium*. They appear to illustrate a passage in Cicero's *In Verrem*, ii. 1, 55, where he speaks of the columns of the Temple of Castor, *quas dealbatis videtis*, referring to the work done by Verres when aedile.<sup>3</sup>

Among traces of the old gardens of Sallust, recently investigated, there has come to light a headless female statue in Greek marble, wearing Doric chiton and apotygma. It is five feet high, and of a Peloponnesian type dating from about 500–480 B.C. (cf. *Röm. Mittheil.* 1900, p. 181). It was found in an edifice built partly of *opus reticulatum*, partly of *opus quadratum*, together with amphorae, fragments of statuary, a fluted column of African marble, and a plain one of *cipollino*.<sup>4</sup>

In the Via dell' Ara Celi was found a fragment of a stone pedestal inscribed COSEDO... ONE CAPTOM. It may be classified with other records of the capture of Greek and Sicilian cities in the third century B.C., with the consequent removal of their works of art to Rome. Unfortunately in this case we cannot tell the name of the city.<sup>4</sup>

Outside the Porta S. Paolo a stone altar has been found with relief representing a four-wheeled cart drawn at high speed by two mules, the driver cracking his whip. The altar was an *ex-voto* offering by a muleteer named Severus to Epona, whose intervention had saved him from an accident. Further along the road were discovered tombs of the second century, belonging to the Gens Claudia.<sup>4</sup>

During the construction of a new Carmelite monastery, an enormous number of inscriptions have been found, mostly very uninteresting. One describes a *collegium* formed among the freedmen and servants of L. Tarius Rufus, under the presidency of his wife's physician Agrypnus, who died at the age of 27, and to whom a tablet was erected by his *mater calamitosa*. Another belongs to a banker from Reate, and a third to an imperial freedman who was a *caelator*; a fourth relates to one Grattius, *indigne subiectus morte nefanda, occisus calce et manibus* by a ruffian whom he thus apostrophizes: *Hoc opto, moriære malis exemplis cruciatus*!<sup>4</sup>

*Pompeii*.—A silver saucepan (*trulla*) of very fine workmanship has been discovered; the handle is ornamented with reliefs, consisting of a steering-oar with a dolphin twisted round the handle holding a polypus in its mouth; in the field, a crab and molluscs; at the base of the handle a sea-lion (?). Also 187 coins, mostly of the period from Tiberius to Domitian, all being bronze except one denarius of Domitian.<sup>1</sup>

*Pietrabbondante (Bovianum Vetus)*. A hoard of

bronze coins of Campania found here consists of 17 pieces of *aes grave* and 256 bronzes, mostly of Neapolis, also of Cales, Suessa, and Aesernia. Some appear to be coins of other places on which Neapolis legends and types have been impressed over the original design. Of the *aes grave*, some belong to the 'Apollo' series, some to that of 'Mercury and Janus.' The Aesernia coins cannot be earlier than 263 B.C., the year of the foundation of a Latin colony there.<sup>3</sup>

*Padula (Salerno)*.—As recorded in the *Notizie* of March 1900, p. 110, a fragment of a stone found here seemed likely to establish the position of the ancient Consilinum at the modern Padula. The rest of the stone has now been found, and that idea is confirmed. The whole inscription runs: M · VEHLIVS PRIMVS | CVR · R · P · COSILINATIVM | PORTICVM HERCVLIS | A SOLO IMPENSA · R · P · INS | TANTIA SVA · F · C.<sup>1</sup>

*Ceglie, Apulia*.—In 1898 a large tomb was discovered containing many fine Apulian vases. The two best were a hydria with Peleus surprising Thetis, and an amphora with volute handles; Obv. Perseus shewing the Gorgon's head to the Satyrs, and a 'courting' scene below; Rev. Dionysiac scene.<sup>1</sup>

*Tarentum*.—An important find has been made, of a gold stater coined at Tarentum in the time of Pyrrhus. On the obverse is a head of Zeus Eleutherios crowned, with AK; on the rev., an eagle on thunderbolt, and Athena Promachos; inscribed TAPAN. The Athena is the symbol of Pyrrhus (cf. the coins struck by him at Syracuse). Only two other examples of this type are known, one in Berlin (Evans, *Horsemen of Tarentum*, pl. 5, fig. 17) and the other in the Hunter Collection at Glasgow (Macdonald's *Cat.* No. 22).<sup>3</sup>

## GREECE.

*Aegina*.—Prof. Furtwaengler has now published full details of his excavations at the temple (see *June Record*, p. 287). The first excavations resulted in the finding of two heads from the pediments and numerous fragments of limbs, together with all kinds of small archaic votive offerings, and a Propylaea of considerable interest, within which were the two heads. Of these one is bearded with a helmet, and is from the left side of the eastern pediment; it corresponds to No. 86 in the Munich Catalogue. The other is beardless, with a Corinthian helmet, from the right side of the western pediment, and probably corresponds to No. 82. The Propylaea had on the S. E. an outer hall open to the south, and another inner one, each with eight octagonal pillars, mostly still *in situ*; also one capital remaining. On the north were three steps leading to the level of the temple; there are also remains of the terracotta roof, including a figure of a Gryphon. On the N. E. of the temple is an ancient water-pipe conducting the rain from the roof to a reservoir; near this were found fibulae, pins, and island-gems. To the south of the Propylaea were found terracottas: an Aphrodite with dove, a seated goddess of Ionic type, and lamps.<sup>5</sup>

The reservoir was afterwards cleared out, and contained fragments of marble tiles and Gryphon-antefixes, also fragments of limbs and seven marble heads, all helmeted. Two of these are bearded and three youthful, but it is not certain if they are from the pediments. A female head of more archaic type and a girl's head in a hood of about 480 B.C. were also found, together with the left hand of the Athena of the east pediment and the right hand of the

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Nov. 1900.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, Dec. 1900.

<sup>4</sup> *Athenaeum*, 15 June.

<sup>5</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 4 May.



fallen man in the middle of the western, holding not a sword but a stone. The temple terrace has also been cleared, and at the lowest levels Mycenaean idols and animals were found, together with rude hand-made pottery. Above these were fragments of Corinthian and 'proto-Corinthian' vases, porcelain figures and scarabs, and fragments of Naucratis pottery with white ground and inscriptions. Inside the temple were found traces of the base of the cultus-statue, and holes for wooden railings; on the east terrace, foundations of a large altar, and at the S. E. corner a row of chambers containing marble holy-water basins. All these remains belong to a good Greek period.<sup>6</sup>

On the south terrace blocks from an older building

appeared, which soon proved to belong to an older temple; later, architectural fragments turned up, with colours well preserved, including capitals with very flat echinus. This temple must have been early sixth century Doric. Among the debris of the terrace were numerous fragments of vases, not earlier than 500 B.C., and below these, remains extending back from the sixth century to the Mycenaean period. Of a later date the only remains were some fragments of Hellenistic vases with reliefs and Roman lamps. Among the architectural remains of the second temple there have been found some blocks from the horizontal cornice of the pediment, with sinkings for the pedestals of the pediment figures.<sup>7</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 18 May.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 1 June.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

**Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, etc.** Vol. 7. Part 1, 1901.

*Die Analyse als Grundlage der Höheren Kritik*, A. Gercke. Shows with examples on what the higher criticism is based, how it stands towards linguistic criticism, and how it reaches its solutions (to be continued). *Alkestisstudien*, L. Bloch. Women have only a passive part to play in the older epos, and in Hesiod, where their position is more responsible, they have only duties, no rights. Later, in the time of the tragedians, women are only considered in Aeschylus as in subordination to men. In Sophocles, on the contrary, under the influence of the freer Ionian spirit, the woman stands free and equal with the man. Euripides, leaving the heroic, exhibits women of flesh and blood who are the subjects of passions, often of revenge; he is no absolute foe to the sex. His Alcestis can only be rightly appreciated if, putting modern prepossessions aside, we regard Admetus as much more the lord than the husband—in short as the Thessalian Hades (to be concluded). *Hermunduren und Marcomannen*, E. Devrient. These tribes, both belonging to the Suevian confederation, were for centuries in close connexion. The latter are first mentioned by Caesar, in connexion with Ariovistus, while Strabo first mentions the Hermunduri as, in 9 B.C., dwelling on both sides of the middle Elbe.

After 5 A.D. the Marcomanni who were settled between the Elbe and Frauenwald gave up their land to the Hermunduri and withdrew to Bohemia, whither the H. soon followed them. In the time of Tacitus (*Germania*, 41) the Hermunduri traded briskly with the province of Rhaetia and possessed the land round the Fichtelgebirge, westward to the borders of the Chatti and the *limes Romanus* and eastward to the sources of the Elbe. Towards the end of the second century A.D. their name disappears. Ptolemy does not mention them. In 214 Caracalla set out to protect a tribe—no doubt the Hermunduri outside Bohemia—against the Alemanni, but he ended by coming to terms with the latter. In Bohemia the name of Hermunduri maintained itself some time longer. J. Ilberg eulogises the collected

speeches and scattered writings of U. v. Wilamowitz. E. R. Gast considers the uses of *cum* and contests the usual division of *cum*, temporal, causal, concessive, inverted, &c.

**Wechenschrift für Klassische Philologie.** 1901.

22 May. A. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (W. Schmid) I. J. Lebreton, *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron et Caesariensis syntaxis quatenus a Ciceroniana differat* (A. F.), favourable. F. Antoine, *De la parataxe et de l'hypotaxe dans la langue latine* (H. Ziemer). 'What is new is not good and the good is not new.'

29 May. C. Gaspar, *Essai de chronologie Pin-darique* (O. Schroeder). Not fruitful in results. A. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (W. Schmid) II., very favourable. E. de Jong, *De Apuleio Isacorum mysteriorum teste* (C. Wessely), 'shows good judgment and diligence, but is very incomplete.'

5 June. K. Joël, *Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates II.* (A. Döring), unfavourable on the whole. Vol. I. appeared in 1893. S. Fighiera, *La lingua e la grammatica di C. Crispo Sallustio* (Th. Opitz), favourable. A. Cima, *Analecta Latina* (J. Tolkienn), favourable. E. Haugwitz, *Der Palatin, seine Geschichte und seine Ruinen* (H. Belling), unfavourable.

12 June. *Analecta sacra et profana* (W. Lüdtke), favourable. J. Partsch, *Heinrich Kiepert. Ein Bild seines Lebens und seiner Arbeit*. Ph. Fabia, *La préface des Histoires de Tacite* (G. Andresen), favourable.

19 June. *Catalogue des Plombs de l'antiquité*. M. Rostovtsew et M. Prou (K. Regling), favourable. Hiller v. Gaertringen, *Ausgrabungen in Griechenland* (P. W.). 'A beautiful little book which every one will be glad to read.' H. Willrich, *Judaica* (H. Drüner), favourable. H. Peter, *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I. und ihre Quellen* (M. Ihm), very favourable. W. E. P. Pantin, *Easy Exercises in continuous Prose* (C. Stegmann). 'Gives the impression of a sensible and useful work.'



## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

- Adami* (F.) *De poetis scaenicis graecis hymnorum sacrorum imitatoribus*. 8vo. 30 pp. Leipzig.
- Aeschines*. Detto (P.) *De genetivi apud Aeschinem usu*. 4to. 13 pp. Magdeburg.
- Aeschylus*. Perser, erklärt von W. S. Teuffel. 4th edition by N. Wecklein. 8vo. vi, 104 pp. Map and plate. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 M. 50.
- *I Persiani, con note di V. Inama*. 8vo. xxxii, 116 pp. Torino. 2 lire 40.
- *Tragedies and Fragments*. Translated by the late E. H. Plumptre. Notes. Rhymed Choral Odes. 2 vols. 12mo. 434 pp. Isbister. 5s.
- *Prometheus vincetus*, ed. by C. E. Laurence. 18mo. Bell. 2s.
- Alcaeus*. The Songs. Memoir and Text, with literal and verse translations and notes by J. S. Easby-Smith. Crown 8vo. Hirschfeld. 10s. 6d.
- Anapich* (A. E.) *De Alexandri Magni expeditione Indiae*. Fasc. I. 8vo. 37 pp. Duisburg.
- Anzeiger (archäologischer)*. Beiblatt zum Jahrbuch des archäologischen Institutes. Jahrgang 1901. (4 pts.). Pt. 1. 4 to. 47 pp., engravings. Berlin. Reimer. 4 M.
- Apollodorus*. Jacoby, (F.) *De Apollodori Atheniensis chronica*. 8vo. 32 pp. Berlin.
- Appian*. Civil Wars, Book I, translated by E. F. M. Benecke. 2nd edition. Crown 8vo. 110 pp. Simpkin. 2s. 6d.
- Aristophanes*. Comediae. Vol. II. Edited by F. W. Hall and W. Geldart. (Oxford Classics.) Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- *The Frogs, with introduction and notes by W. W. Merry*. 12 mo. 160 pp. Frowde. 3s.
- Aristoteles*. Heideil (W. A.) *The necessary and the contingent in the Aristotelian system*. 8vo. 46 pp. Chicago. 35 cts.
- *La costituzione di Atene*. Testo e commento per cura di A. Cosattini. 8vo. xxx, 232 pp., facsimile plate. Firenze, Le Monnier. 3 lire.
- *Bitterauf, (C.) Quaestiuiculae criticae ad Aristotelis Parva Naturalia pertinentes*. 8vo. 27 pp. München.
- Arwin* (H. von). *Bemerkungen zum Index Stoicorum Heraclanensis*. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wiss.') 8vo. 13 pp. Wien, Gerold. 40 Pf.
- Arnobius*. Spindler (P.) *De Arnobii genere dicendi*. 8vo. 75 pp. Strassburg.
- Aubert* (A.). *Der Dornauszieher auf dem Kapitol und die Kunstarchaeologie*. (Aus 'Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst.') 4 to. 18 pp., engravings. Leipzig, Seemann. 2 M.
- Audollent* (A.). *Carthage romaine (146 avant Jésus Christ—698 après J. Chr.)*. 8vo. xxxii, 834 pp., 3 maps. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc. 84.) Paris, Fontemoing.
- Aecius*. Vahlen (J.) *De Aecii poetae tragici de comœdiis Plautinis loco a Gellio relato disputatio*. 4to. 14 pp. Berlin.
- Bacchylides*. Prentice (W. K.) *De Bacchylide Pindari artis socio et imitatore*. 8vo. 66 pp. Halle.
- Barnabei* (F.) *La villa pompeiana di P. Fannio Sinistore, scoperta presso Boscoreale*. 8vo. 85 pp. 11 plates. Roma, Accad. dei lincei.
- Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*. Herausgegeben von C. F. Lehmann. Vol. I. Part I. 8vo. 187 pp. 1 map. Leipzig, Dieterich. Each volume (3 parts) 20 M.
- Bennett* (C. E.) and G. P. Bristol. *Teaching of Latin and Greek in the Secondary School*. Crown 8vo. Longmans. 5s.
- Beresford* (R. A. A.) *First Latin Reader*. Crown 8vo. 100 pp., engravings. Blackie. 1s. 6d.
- Botsford* (G. W.) *History of Rome for High Schools and Academies*. 12mo. xiv, 396 pp. New York. \$1 10c.
- Bruns* (J.) *Frauenemancipation in Athen, ein Beitrag zur Attischen Kulturgeschichte des V. und VI. Jahrhunderts*. 8vo. 31 pp. Kiel.
- Burton* (E. D.) *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. 4th edition. 12 mo. 216 pp. Chicago. \$1 50c.
- Caesar*. Buch (W.) *Caesar als Schriftsteller im bellum Gallicum*. 4to. 13 pp. Steglitz.
- *Gallie War, Book v., edited by J. Brown*. 12mo. Blackie. 1s. 6d.
- Cicero's Reden über den Oberbefehl des Cn. Pompeius und für L. Murena*. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von K. Rossberg. 8vo. xxii, 90 pp. Münster. 80 Pf.
- *I tre libri de oratore*. Testo riveduto e annotato da A. Cima. Libro I. 2da edizione. 8vo. xxiii, 167 pp. Torino, Loescher. 2 lire 50.
- *Lebreton (J.) Etudes sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron*. 8vo. xxvii, 474 pp. Paris, Hachette.
- Codices graeci et latini*, photographice depicti duce S. de Vries. Vol. vi. *Homeri Ilias cum scholiis*. Codex Venetus A. Marcianus 454 phototypice editus. Praefatus est D. Comparetti. Folio. xiv, 641 pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. 310 M.
- Collignon* (M.) *Torse féminine d'ancien style ionien provenant de Clazomène*. 8vo. 7 pp., 2 plates. Paris, Leroux.
- Conforti* (L.) *Das Nationalmuseum in Neapel, ins Deutsche übertragen von P. E. Lorenz*. Folio. 50 pp. 162 plates. Neapel. 24 M.
- Cybulski* (S.) *Das Kriegswesen der alten Griechen*. (Letterpress to Nrs. I. and II. of 'Tabulae quibus antiquitates graecae et romanae illustrantur'). 2nd edition. 8vo. 32 pp. 13 engravings. Leipzig, Köhler. 1 M.
- Deile* (G.) *Klingers und Grillparzers Medea mit einander und mit den antiken Vorbildern des Euripides und Seneca verglichen*. 8vo. 31 pp. Erfart.
- Demetrius Cydonius*. Deckelmann (H.) *Demetrii Cydonii de contemnenda morte oratio ex codice edita*. 8vo. 47 pp. Leipzig.
- Democritus*. Frommüller (W.) *Democrit, seine Homer-Studien und Ansichten*. 8vo. 67 pp. Erlangen.
- Demosthenes*. Heerdegen (F.) *Über parenthetische Sätze und Satzverbindungen in der Kranzrede des Demosthenes*. (Aus 'Festschrift d. Univ. Erlangen für Prinzregent Luitpold'). 8vo. 26 pp. Leipzig. 80 Pf.
- Detlefsen* (D.) *Pote und seine Verwendung im Lateinischen*. 4to. 14 pp. Glückstadt.
- Dio Chrysostomus*. Fischer (P.) *De Dionis Chrysostomi orationis tertiae compositione et fontibus*. 8vo. 46 pp. Bonn.
- Diodor*. Kallenberg (H.) *Textkritik und Sprachgebrauch Diodors*. I. 4to. 23 pp. Berlin, Springer. 1 M.
- Dümmler* (E.) *Über den Dialog De statu sanctae ecclesiae*. 8vo. 25 pp. Berlin.

- Durham* (C. L.) The subjunctive substantive clauses in Plautus, not including indirect questions. (Cornell Studies.) 8vo. vi, 120 pp. New York. 80 cts.
- Eller* (A.) Γνωμικά δμοιωματα des Socrates, Plutarch, Demophilus, Demonax, Aristonymus u. a. (Gnomica homoeomata I). 4to. 78 columns. Bonn.
- Euripides*. Bacchae, edited by G. M. Gwyther. 12mo. Bell. 1s. 6d.
- Hécube, expliquée littéralement, traduite en Français et annotée par C. Leprévost. 16mo. 159 pp. Paris, Hachette. 2 fr.
- Medea. Text, Introduction, Notes by J. Thompson and T. R. Mills. Crown 8vo. 108 pp. (Univ. Tutor. Series.) Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Ferrero* (Erm.) L'arc d'Auguste à Suse. Folio. 48 pp., 19 plates. Torino, Bocca. 35 lire.
- Fink* (J.) Formen und Stempel römischer Thonlampen. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichten der bayer. Akademie der Wiss.'). 8vo. 18 pp., plate. München, Franz. 1 M.
- Fischer* (E.) Archäologische Erinnerungen an eine Studienreise nach Griechenland. 4to. 20 pp. 1 map. Breslau.
- Flasch* (Ad.) Die sogenannte Spinnerin, Erzbild in der Münchener Glyptothek. (Aus 'Festschrift der Univ. Erlangen für Prinzregent Luitpold'). 8vo. 22 pp. 2 engravings and 2 plates. Leipzig, Deichert. 1 M. 40.
- Florilegium graecum* in usum primi gymnasiorum ordinis collectum a philologis Afranis. Fasc. xi. xv. 8vo. Each fasc. 64 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Each fasc. 60 Pf.
- Fregni* (Gius.) Archeologio Messinese: di una iscrizione detta di lingua Osea in una vecchia lapida della via Cardines in Messina: studi storici e filologici. 8vo. 20 pp., facsimile plate. Modena. 50 cent.
- Fundberichte*. aus Schwaben, umfassend die vorgeschichtlichen, römischen und merowingischen Altertümer. In Verbindung mit dem württembergischen Altertumsverein herausgegeben vom württembergischen anthropologischen Verein unter Leitung von G. Sixt. Jahrgang 8. (1900). 8vo. 80 pp., engravings. Stuttgart, Schweizerbart. 1 M. 60.
- Furtwängler* (A.) Zum Diskobol Lancelotti.—Zur Venus von Milo und der Theodoridas-Basis. 8vo. 11 pp. München.
- Gottschick*. Boner und seine lateinischen Vorlagen. 4to. 39 pp. Charlottenburg.
- Green* (S. G.) Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament, with a complete vocabulary and examination of the synonyms. 12 mo. 564 pp. New York. 82.
- Greenidge* (A. H. J.) Legal procedure of Cicero's time. 8vo. Frowde. 21s.
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, herausgegeben von Iwan von Mueller. Vol. ii. Section iii.: Rhetorik und Metrik der Griechen und Römer. 3. Aufl. von R. Volkmann, C. Hammer und H. Gleditsch. 8vo. x, 336 pp., 2 plates of musical notation. München, Beck. 8 M. 80.
- Haugwitz* (Eberh. Graf.) Der Palatin, seine Geschichte und seine Ruinen. Mit Vorwort von Prof. Dr. Chr. Hülsen. 8vo. xiv, 182 pp., map, engravings. Rom, Loescher. 6 M.
- Hephaestion*. Consbruch, (M.) Zur Überlieferung von Hephaestions ἐγχειρίδιον περὶ μέτρων. 4 to. 22 pp. Halle.
- Heraclitos*. Diels (H.) Zwei Fragmente Heraclits. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften.') 8vo. 14 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.
- Heraclitos*. von Ephesos, griechisch und deutsch herausgegeben von H. Diels. 8vo. xii, 56 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M. 40.
- Herondae mimiambi*. Accedunt Phoeniceis Coronistae, Mattii, mimiamborum fragmenta. Tertium ed. Otto Crusius. Ed. minor. 12mo. iii, 96 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M. 40.
- Herondas*. Les Mimes. Traduction littérale accompagnée de notes par P. Quillard. 2 de édition. 18 mo. xxvi, 153 pp. Paris. Mercure de France. 2 fr.
- Herzog* (Rud.) Das Heiligtum des Apollo in Halasarna. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften'). 8vo. 25 pp. 1 map, 1 plate. Berlin, Reimer. 1 M.
- Hippocrates*. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, (U. v.) Die hippocratiche Schrift περὶ λεπῆς νόσου. 8vo. 22 pp. Berlin.
- Hoffmann* (Gust.) Zur Methode des griechischen Grammatikunterrichtes. Pt. 2. 4to. 13 pp. Gross-Strehlitz. 1 M.
- (M.) August Böckh. Lebensbeschreibung und Auswahl aus seinem wissenschaftlichen Briefwechsel. 8vo. viii, 483 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 M.
- Homer*. Hoerenz (C.) De vetustiore versus heroici forma in Homeri carminibus inventa. 4to. 24 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 1 M.
- Muß (Ch.) Der Zauber der Homerischen Poesie. 8vo. 37 pp. Erfurt.
- Robert (C.) Studien zur Ilias. Mit Beiträgen von Fr. Bechtel. 8vo. viii, 591 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 16 M.
- Roemer (Ad.) Homerische Gestalten und Gestaltungen. (Aus 'Festschrift der Univ. Erlangen für Prinzregent Luitpold'). 8vo. 20 pp. Leipzig, Deichert. 80 Pf.
- Welzel (P.) Betrachtungen über Homer's Odyssee als Kunstwerk. 4to. 18 pp. Breslau.
- Horace*. Thiele (R.) Horaz und sein Säculargedicht. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der hellenischen Dichtweise in Rom. 8vo. 29 pp. Erfurt.
- Hurl* (E. M.) Greek Sculpture: a collection of sixteen pictures, with introduction and interpretation. (Riverside Art Series.) 8vo. 17, 96 pp. Boston. 75c.
- Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes*, auctoritate et impensis academiae inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum collectae et editae. Tomus I, fasc. 1. Curavit R. Cagnat, auxiliante J. Toutain. 8vo. 128 pp. Paris, Leroux. 2 fr. 75c.
- Jahrbuch des Kais. deutschen archäologischen Instituts*, herausgegeben von Prof. Conze. Vol. xv. Pt. 1. 4to. 38, 47 pp. engravings. Berlin, Reimer. pr. vol. 20 M.
- Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien*. Vol. IV. Part I. 4to. 150 pp., 72 col., 180 engravings, 4 plates. Wien, Holder. Each vol. (2 parts) 15 M.
- Joel* (K.) Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates. Vol. II. 8vo. xxv, ix, 1145 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 28 M.
- Jurisprudentiae antehadrianae quae supersunt* ed. F. P. Bremer. Pars II. Primi post principatum constitutum saeculi juris consulti. Sectio II. 12mo. xxvii, 639 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 M.
- Juvenal*. Edited with notes and indices by H. Parks Wright. (College Series.) 12 mo. 42, 240 pp. Boston, Ginn. \$1. 35c.
- Kekule von Stradonitz* (R.) Über das Relief mit der Inschrift C. I. L. vi. 426. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akademie der Wiss.'). 8vo. 12 pp., 3 engravings. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.
- Kemmer* (F.) Die polare Ausdrucksweise in der griechischen Literatur. 8vo. 71 pp. Würzburg.

- Kenner (F.)** Bericht über römische Funde in Wien in den Jahren 1896-1900. Herausgegeben von der k.k. Centralkommission für Kunst und historische Denkmale. 4to. vi, 91 pp., 1 plate, 93 engravings. Wien, Braumüller. 6 M.
- Kiepert (Heinr.)** *Formae orbis antiqui*. 36 maps with critical letterpress to each map. Map xix.: Italia inferior cum insulis, ed. Rich. Kiepert. (1: 1,600,000). Map (43×56 cm.) Letterpress. Folio. 5 pp. Berlin, D. Reimer. 3 M.
- Koch (K.)** *Quae fuerit ante Socratem vocabuli ἀρετή notio*. 8vo. III, 65 pp. (Braunschweig).
- Kopp (W.)** *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*. 7th edition by O. Seyffert. Crown 8vo. viii, 147 pp. Berlin, Springer. 2 M.
- *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*. 6th Edition by G. H. Müller. Crown 8vo. xii, 243 pp. Berlin, Springer. 3 M.
- Kornemann (E.)** *Zur Geschichte antiker Herrscherkulte*. (Aus 'Beiträge zur alten Geschichte.') 8vo. 96 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 4 M. 80.
- Kroll (W.)** *Analecta graeca*. 8vo. 16 pp. Greifswald.
- Kröll (M.)** *Die Beziehungen des klassischen Altertums zu den Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments*. 8vo. ix, 66 pp. Trier. 1 M. 20.
- Kuhn (C.)** *Zur Erklärung homerischer Beiwörter (ἄδώς, ἀργύρεος)*. 8vo. 19 pp. Königsberg.
- Lanciani (R.)** *Forma Urbis Romae consilio et auctoritate R. Academiae Lynceaeorum formam dimensum est et ad modulum 1: 1000 delineavit*. folio. 46 sheets. Milano, Hoepli. 200 lire.
- Leo (Fr.)** *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form*. 8vo. v, 329 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 7 M.
- Lermann (W.)** *Athenatypen auf griechischen Münzen*. 8vo. 58 pp. München.
- Levy (L.)** *Quomodo Tiberius Claudius Nero erga Senatum se gesserit*. 8vo. 134 pp. Paris, Alcan.
- Lieberich (H.)** *Studien zu den Proömien in der griechischen und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung*. 8vo. 62 pp. München.
- Limes (der römische)** in Oesterreich. Herausgegeben von der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Part II. 4to. v. pp., 160 col., 50 engravings, 24 plates. Wien, Holder. 14 M.
- (der obergermanisch-rätische) des Römerreiches. Im Auftrag der Reichs-Limeskommission herausgegeben von O. von Sarwey, E. Fabricius, F. Hettner. Part 13. 4to. 22, 13, 11 pp., engravings, 11 plates. Heidelberg, Petters. 6 M.
- Levy**. Book II., with introduction and notes, by R. S. Conway. 12mo. (Pitt Press Series.) Clay. 2s. 6d.
- Book XXII., edited with introduction, notes, vocabulary, test papers and translation by J. Thompson and F. G. Plaistowe. Crown 8vo. 270 pp. (Univ. Tutor Series.) Clive. 4s. 6d.
- Drescher (F.) *Beiträge zur Livius epitome*. 8vo. 49 pp. Erlangen.
- Mocznyski (P.) *De Titii Livi in libris ab urbe condita propria elocutione*. I. 4to. 25 pp. Deutsch-Krone.
- Lundk (I.)** *De paricidii vocis origine*. 8vo. 18 pp. Odessa. 1 M.
- Lycophron**. La Alessandra di Licofrone. Testo, traduzione e commento per cura di E. Ciaceri. 8vo. xviii, 369 pp. Catania. 8 lire.
- Magnus (H.)** *Die Augenheilkunde der Alten*. 8vo. xviii, 691 pp. 23 engravings, 7 plates. Breslau, Kern. 24 M.
- Marchant (E. C.)** and J. G. Spencer. *Latin course for first year*. (3 parts.) Part II. Crown 8vo. 150 pp. Bell. 1s. 6d.
- Marcus Aurelius**. *Pensées de Marc Aurèle*. Traduction nouvelles par G. Michaut. 8vo. xxi, 242 pp. Paris, Fontemoing.
- Maximianus**. *The Elegies*, edited by R. Webster. 8vo. 126 pp. Princeton. \$1.
- Meyer (Ed.)** *Geschichte des Altertums*. Vol. III. Das Perserreich und die Griechen. I. Half Volume: Bis zu den Friedensschlüssen von 448 und 446 v.c. 8vo. xiv, 691 pp., map. Stuttgart, Cotta. 13 M.
- (Leo) *Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie*. Vol. I. 8vo. 656 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 14 M.
- Milchhoefer (A.)** *Ueber die Gräberkunst der Hellenen*. 8vo. 22 pp. Kiel.
- Minos (J.)** *Ein neu entdecktes Geheimschrift-System der Alten*. Mit Proben. 8vo. viii, 64 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 2 M. 40.
- Mitteilungen über römische Funde in Heddernheim*. III. Herausgegeben von dem Verein für Geschichte und Altertumskunde zu Frankfurt a/M. 4to. iii, 100 pp. 2 plates. Frankfurt, Völkler. 4 M.
- Mommsen (Th.)** *Ancyranische Inschrift des Julius Severus*. 8vo. 8 pp. Berlin.
- Morawski (Cas.)** *Rhetorum Romanorum ampullae*. 8vo. 20 pp. Krakau. 50 Pf.
- Müller (Eng.)** *Kaiser Flavius Claudius Julianus. Biographie nebst Auswahl seiner Schriften*. 8vo. viii, 136 pp. Hannover, Rehtmeyer. 4 M.
- Negri (Gae.)** *L'imperatore Giuliano l'Apostata, studio storico*. 16mo. xx, 509 pp. Milano, Hoepli. 6 lire 50.
- Nepos**. Schleier (H.) *De epistolis, quarum fragmenta in Corneli Nepotis libris traduntur, Corneliae, Gracchorum matri, vindicandis*. 8vo. 30 pp. München.
- Nitzsche**. *Über die griechischen Grabreden der Klassischen Zeit*. I. 4to. 20 pp. Altenburg. 1 M.
- Notor (G.)** *La femme dans l'antiquité grecque*. Avec une préface par Eng. Müntz. 4to. iv, 284 pp., 320 engravings, 33 coloured plates. Paris, Laurens.
- Ovid**. *Elegies*. Selections by F. C. Smith. 12mo. Bell. 1s. 6d.
- *Metamorphoses*. Book III, lines 1-130. With introduction, notes, vocabulary, and test questions by W. P. Steen and B. J. Haynes. Crown 8vo. 40 pp. (Univ. Tutor Series.) Clive. 1s. 6d.
- Vollgraff (G.) *De Ovidii mythopoeia quaestiones sex*. 8vo. 97 pp. Berlin.
- Pelka (O.)** *Altchristliche Ehedenkmäler*. 8vo. 30 pp. Erlangen.
- Philippson (A.)** *Beiträge zur griechischen Inselwelt*. (134. Ergänzungsheft zu Petermann's Geographischen Mittheilungen.) 4to. iv, 172 pp., 4 maps. Gotha, J. Perthes. 10 M.
- Plato**. *Meno*, with introduction, notes, excursions by E. Seymour Thompson. 12mo. 386 pp. Macmillan. 5s.
- Janell (W.) *Quaestiones Platonicae*. 8vo. 44 pp. Rostock, 1901.
- Kösters (H.) *Das Parmenideische Sein im Verhältnis zur Platonischen Ideenlehre*. 4to. 15 pp. Viersen.
- Schöber (R.) *Das Staatsideal Plato's*. 8vo. 25 pp. Elbing.
- Sill (H. A.) *Untersuchungen über die Platonischen Briefe*. I. Teil: Prolegomena. 8vo. 42 pp. Halle.
- Wecklein (N.) *Platonische Studien*. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften.') 8vo. 22 pp. München, Franz. 40 Pf.
- Plantus**. *L'Aululaire (la Marmite)*, comédie en cinq

- actes, traduction en vers de P. Richard. 16mo. 63 pp. Paris, Delagrave.
- Pliny*. Allain (E.) *Pline le jeune et ses héritiers*. 8vo. 615 pp. Paris, Fontemoing.
- Polybius*. Büttner-Wobst (Th.) *Beiträge zu Polybios*. 8vo. 26 pp. Dresden.
- Pottier* (E.) *Pourquoi Thésée fut l'ami d'Hercule*. 4to. 23 pp., engraving. Paris, Librairie de l'Art.
- Praschler* (K.) *Hierokles der Stoiker*. 8vo. viii, 159 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 5 M.
- Prasek* (J. V.) *Die ersten Jahre Dareios' des Hystaspiden und der altpersische Kalender*. (Aus 'Beiträge zur alten Geschichte'). 8vo. 25 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 1 M. 25.
- Preuner* (E.) *Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk*. 8vo. 115 pp. Strassburg.
- Proclus*. Proclus le philosophe, Commentaire sur le Parménide, suivi du commentaire anonyme sur les sept hypothèses. Traduit pour la première fois en français et accompagné de notes, par A. E. Chaignet. 8vo. 411 pp. Paris, Leroux.
- Rauschen* (G.) *Das griechisch-römische Schulwesen zur Zeit des ausgehenden Heidentums*. 8vo. vi, 86 pp. 1 engraving. Bonn, Cohen. 1 M. 60.
- Rentsch* (J.) *De δικη ψευδοκαταγραφών in jure Attico comparatis Platonis imprimis legum libris cum orationibus Atticis*. 8vo. 64 pp. Leipzig.
- Robertson* (A. T.) *New Testament Greek syllabus for Junior Greek class*. 16mo. 99 pp. Louisville, Ky. 50 c.
- Rohde* (Erwin) *Kleine Schriften*. 2 vols. (Vol. I. *Beiträge zur Chronologie, Quellenkunde und Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (xxxi, 436 pp.) II. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Romans und der Novelle, zur Sagen-, Märchen- und Altertums-Kunde*. (iii, 481 pp.) 8vo. Tübingen, Mohr. 24 M.
- Royen* (J. v.) *De vocabulis patronymicis et ethnicis a poetis latinis per metonymiam nominum propriorum loco positis*. 8vo. 85 pp. Halle.
- Ruhland* (Max) *Die eleusinischen Göttinnen. Entwicklung ihrer Typen in der attischen Plastik*. 8vo. xi, 108 pp., 9 engravings, 3 plates. Strassburg, Trübner. 5 M.
- Seck* (O.) *Decemprimat und Dekaprotie*. (Aus 'Beiträge zur alten Geschichte.') 8vo. 41 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 2 M. 10.
- Seelye* (W. J.) *A new Greek Method*. 12mo. vi, 155 pp. Wooster, O., U.S.A. 75 c.
- Seneca*. Badstübner (E.) *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik der philosophischen Schriften Senecas*. 4to. 28 pp. Hamburg.
- Wirth (H.) *De Virgiliis apud Senecam philosophum usu*. 8vo. 61 pp. Freiburg.
- Shuckburgh* (E. S.) *Short history of the Greeks from the Earliest Times to B.C. 146*. Crown 8vo. 412 pp., maps, engravings. (Cambridge Series for Schools.) Clay. 4s. 6d.
- Silverio* (O.) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der attischen Staats-skaven*. 8vo. 66 pp. München.
- Sogliano* (A.) *Guida di Pompei*. 2da Edizione. 16mo. xxxii, 61 pp., 3 plates. Milano. 2 lire.
- Sommer* (L.) *De prothesi et aphaeresi e glossariis Latinis illustrandis*. 8vo. 37 pp. Jena.
- Sophocles*. Richter (Wold.) *Die Parodos und die Stasima in Sophocles Trachinierinnen*. 8vo. 112 pp. Schaffhausen. 2 M.
- St. Clair* (G.) *Myths of Greece explained and dated. Embalmed History from Uranus to Perseus, including Eleusinian Mysteries and Olympic Games*. 2 vols. 8vo. 798 pp. Williams and N. 16s.
- Tacitus*. Germania erklärt von G. von Kobilinski. (Text and Notes.) 8vo. 128 pp. Map. 1 M. 80.
- Wölfflin (Ed.) *Zur Composition der Historien des Tacitus*. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der bayer. Akademie der Wiss.') 8vo. 49 pp. München, Franz. 80 Pf.
- Tegge* (A.) *Die Staatsgewalten der römischen Republik*. 2 parts. 4to. 14, 14 pp. Bunzlau.
- Teichmüller* (F.) *Ambire, —tio, —tiosus, —tiose, —tus*. 4to. 23 pp. Wittstock. 1 M. 20.
- Terence*. Vahlen (J.) *Über die Fragen der Vers-technik des Terentius*. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akademie der Wiss.') 8vo. 17 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 M.
- Theocritus*. Idylls, edited with notes by R. J. Cholmeley. Crown 8vo. Bell. 7s. 6d.
- Thesaurus linguae latinae*. Editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinquae, Berolinensis, Göttingensis, Lipsiensis, Monacensis, Vindobonensis. Vol. II. Fasc. 1. Royal 4to. Col. 1-240. Leipzig, Teubner. 7 M. 20.
- Tituli Asiae Minoris collecti 'et ed. auspiciis academiae litterarum Vindobonensis*. Vol. I. Tituli Lyciae. Lingua Lycia conscripti, enarr. E. Kalinka. Folio. vi, 136 pp., map by R. Heberdey. Wien, Holder. Half vellum. 40 M.
- Tyrrrell* (R. Y.) *Anthology of Latin Poetry*. Crown 8vo. Macmillan. 6s.
- Valerius Maximus*. Maire (S.) *De Diodoro Siculo Valerii Maximi auctore*. 4to. 26 pp. Rostock. 26 S. 4to.
- Vassilis* (M.) *Die Fackel in Kultus und Kunst der Griechen*. 8vo. 84 pp. München.
- Viertel* (A.) *Tiberius und Germanicus*. 8vo. 60 pp. Göttingen.
- Virgil*. Irmischer (E.) *Virgil's Aeneide Buch XII übersetzt*. 4to. 10 pp. Dresden.
- Vogt* (M.) *Der Buchtitel in der römischen Poesie*. 8vo. 98 pp. München.
- Wagner* (E. A.) *Agatharchides und der mittlere Peripatos*. I. Teil. 8vo. 51 pp. Annaberg.
- (O.) *Incerti auctoris epitome rerum gestarum Alexandri Magni*. (E codice Mettensi ed.) 8vo. 77 pp. Strassburg.
- Ward* (C. O.) *History of the ancient working people*. (2 vols.) Vol. II. 12mo. 716 pp. Washington. 82.
- Wilisch* (E.) *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Korinth*. 4to. 48 pp. 2 plates. Zittau.
- Xenophon*. Lauteschläger, *Beiträge zur Xenophon-Lektüre*. 4to. 22 pp. Darmstadt.
- Zosimus*. Leidig (J.) *Quaestiones Zosimaeae*. 8vo. 46 pp. München.